The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XXXVIII OCTOBER 1952 NUMBER 3

A DRAMATISTIC VIEW OF THE ORIGINS OF LANGUAGE

Kenneth Burke

PART ONE

Le néant n'est qu'un mot. Dictionnaire des Sciences Philosophiques.

Die Bejahung ist erst die Verneinung einer Verneinung. Fritz Mauthner, Wörterbuch der Philosophie.

Let your communication be Yea, yea; Nay, nay. Matthew v. 37.

I. The Negative as a Marvel of Language

THIS article is a kind of *tour de force*, locating the specific nature of language in the ability to use the Negative. We are obviously indebted to Bergson's remarks on "The Idea of 'Nothing'."[1] But whereas Bergson is aiming primarily to buttress his notions about "pseudo-problems" in philosophy, we are adapting his concerns to linguistic analysis.

Bergson points out that there are no "negative" conditions in nature. Every situation is positively what it is. For instance, we may *say*, "The ground is *not* damp." But the corresponding actual conditions in nature are those whereby the ground *is* dry. We may say that something "is not" in such and such a place. But so far as nature is concerned, whatever "is not" here is positively somewhere else; or, if it does not exist, then other things actually occupy all places where it "is not."

There are many notable aspects of language, such as classification, specification, abstraction, which have their analogues in purely non-verbal behavior. But the negative is a peculiarly linguistic resource. And because it is so peculiarly linguistic, the study of man as the specifically word-using animal requires special attention to this distinctive marvel, the negative.

Consider the *via negationis* in theology; or those related projects in which "non-being" is taken as the ground of

In addition to his part-time activities as a teacher of literary criticism and linguistic theory, Kenneth Burke has published two books of fiction (The White Oxen *and* Towards a Better Life), *a study of communication* (Permanence and Change), *a theory of history* (Attitudes Toward History), *a collection of essays mainly concerned with literary analysis* (The Philosophy of Literary Form); *and the first two volumes of a series on motivation* (A Grammar of Motives *and* A Rhetoric of Motives). *He is now at work on a third volume,* A Symbolic of Motives.

[1] Henri Bergson, *Creative Evolution,* tr. by Arthur Mitchell (New York, 1911), Ch. 4, pp. 272-298.

being (cf. Boehme's *Ungrund,* or even Kant's dialectic whereby, having summed up the positive world as the "conditioned," he grounds this in the idea of God as the "unconditioned"); or Spinoza's strategic definition in his *Ethics,* "all determination is negation"; or Hegel's principle of Negativity, proclaimed in his *Phenomenology of Mind* as the character of existence; or the adaptation of this in the Marxist dialectic.

There might even be a sense in which we could derive the linguistic faculty itself from the ability to use the Negative *qua* Negative. Or, insofar as this statement must be modified, once we have made the proper allowances we may find that we are still left with some basic insights into the nature of language, and of human relations as shaped by language. In line with these observations, which seem to us not only solid but fertile, we would like to spin some tentative theories built around the following proposition: *The essential distinction between the verbal and the nonverbal is in the fact that language adds the peculiar possibility of the Negative.* We hope to show how the Negative developed from earlier forms and to indicate the many areas in which it operates. We shall later attempt to analyze some typical passages in the light of the Negative.

II. Verbal Realism and the Negative

The problem of the negative is complicated by confusions in linguistic usage. For instance, if you say, "There are no negatives in nature," someone might ask in rebuttal, "Then how about negative electricity? Isn't that as 'natural' as positive electricity?"

Yes, there is the positive phenomenon called "negative electricity." But it might just as fittingly have been called "cathodic electricity," since it appears at the so-called "negative" pole, which is also called a "cathode." And sometimes it actually is called "resinous electricity." Or it might have been called "positive" electricity, whereat the positive kind could have been called "negative" or "anodic."

If you arbitrarily called an entrance "positive," then by the same token an exit might be called "negative"; but there is nothing intrinsically more positive about one than about the other. Either is defined by exactly the set of conditions that make up its positive existence or function. A ditch is as positive as a dyke, though each might be classed as a "negation" of the other.

Since language so often applies the negative to physical conditions, we tend to think that the conditions really are a kind of "negative" in their actual nature. But Bergson makes it quite clear how such *apparent* kinds of negativity can come to be. For instance, if you are *expecting* something to be damp and it is found to be dry, then its dryness is expressible not just as dryness, but as the *negation of your expectation* (as "not wet"). Or, if you wanted a thermometer to show 32, then any and every other reading could be classed as "not 32," though each such reading would be exactly what it positively was.

A great many terms like *opposition, antithesis, alternation, contrast, contradiction, reciprocation, balance,* and even *succession* can be summed up as pairs of elements or processes that "negate" each other. There is no difficulty here, if you employ the terms under properly controlled dialectical conditions, discounting them for their linguistic factor. For instance, if we make a distinction between personal "action" and mechanical "motion," we can discount for language when somebody referred to "the action

of a motor." There is a brand of naive verbal realism, always ready to permeate any terminology. For instance, whereas there is nothing in Marxist "dialectical materialism" as such to require that the concept of negativity be interpreted literally, as though some situations in nature actually *said "no"* to others, the linguistic usage itself can be confused with a state of nature.

All told, the metaphorical resources of language being what they are, we can comfortably say that a man walks down the street by motions whereby one foot "negates" the other; or we can speak of the reciprocal motions as acting to produce out of their antitheses a synthesis. Or, though all natural conditions are positively, materially, what they are, we might say that the bud "negates" the blossom, or that the day "negates" the night. And particularly, as Bergson helps us see, we may use such expressions where intention or expectation is involved.

III. The Perfect Dramatistic Starting-Point

By a "Dramatistic" approach to the negative, as contrasted with the somewhat "Scientist" emphasis in Bergson, we mean: Whereas Bergson starts from problems of truth or falsity, we start from problems of action. Each approach obviously involves the other. And the situation is further complicated by the fact that Bergson's point about the importance of *expectation* in the functioning of the negative is, in our terms, quite "Dramatistic."

Bergson approaches the problem of the negative in terms of the negative *proposition;* but we would approach it in terms of the negative *command.* Where he would build his analysis of the negative about a sentence in the indicative mood, such as "The thing is not here," we would build ours about a sentence in the imperative, such as "Do not do that." We would say that the negative must have begun as a rhetorical or hortatory function, *as with the negative of the Ten Commandments.*

And we would call ourselves "Dramatist" rather than "Scientist" because, whereas there are many places in Bergson's analysis that fit beautifully with such a thesis, it nowhere breaks through clearly to such an example. Bergson's account contains many references to the "admonitory," or "pedagogical," or "social" origins of the negative. And you see how the pragmatistic strand in his thinking helps him in this direction. He also includes a citation from Kant similarly pointed: "The peculiar function of negative propositions is simply to prevent error."

But the ultimate necessary step is missing, because Bergson does not make the final readjustment required by his own theories. For if he is going to stress the *admonitory* function of the negative, or its use "to prevent error," then by the rules of Dramatism he *should look for the most thorough kind of admonition,* the *completion or perfection of the admonitory,* the admonition of admonitions. And where would such *fulfilment* of the admonitory be but in the thou-shalt-not's of the Decalogue?

By our "Dramatist" approach, we leap to such a form as the "essence" of the negative. The steps are these: (1) A totally formalist approach might try to deal with "negative propositions" as such; (2) a "scientist" approach might incline to bring out their use in giving information or instruction; (3) an anthropologically pragmatist approach might widen the notion of informative usefulness by such social terms as *admonitory* and *pedagogical;* (4) a Dra-

matistic approach would look for the "essential" instance of an admonitory or pedagogical negative—and it would find this to perfection in the negatives of the Ten Commandments. Hence we would "start" in the thought of the negative command. Such reduction to the "Complete Hortatory Negative" has its special kind of simplicity, to be distinguished, from atomistic reduction.

IV. The "Positive Pre-Negative"

Unfortunately, however, as soon as we decide on such Codification of Conscience for our model of the Perfect Negative, we find another shift necessary. Though we want to derive the very essence of language from the ability to use the negative as negative, and though we derive the very essence of the negative from the form of the negative commandments, we must ask whether the negative need originally have been such at all.

There are several grounds for thinking of this possibility. If the negative of command is a perfection, or flowering, then by the same token we might well expect that it itself *evolved* from a form relatively imperfect. Further, the imperative negative being closely interwoven with the "sense of right and wrong" that is taken as the mark of mature "reason," one might look for its origins in a "more unreasoning" form. Third (a very weak third, but not to be too promptly dismissed), the "One" family and the "No" family do seem surprisingly close for words so logically at odds. There is the fact that something of great price can be called "priceless," that double negatives sometimes cancel out and sometimes intensify the negative, that Latin and Greek verbs of fearing reverse the normal indicative use of negatives. Nor is it hard to see how the Latin words for *with* and *against* (*cum* and *contra*) can come from the same root, when we think of these two usages in English: "I fought with the enemy; I fought with my friends against the enemy"; and *contra* in the sense of "over against" or "in contact with" has given us the word *country*.

So, at least tentatively, we try to imagine the possibility of an original purely *positive* kind of negative, one closer to those conditions of nature in which there is no negative of the peculiarly linguistic sort.[2]

[2] In his article on the negative, Mauthner writes: "In some era of prehistory, negation was perhaps a wholly physiological voicing of disgust and refusal, an abrupt expulsion of breath through the nostrils, probably intended to symbolize a spewing-forth of disagreeable food." From this usage, he says, it eventually assumed the grammatical form of a noun, whereupon philosophers sought ways "to make a thinkable nothing into a knowable something." Since dislikes are as sensorily real as likes, Mauthner suggests a different kind of positive as origin for the negative: the experience of purely physical revulsion (which is a negative in the *attitudinal* sense, as were we to call thumbs-up positive and thumbs-down negative). Unfortunately, his article does not consider the thou-shalt-not kind of negative. But the indications are that, if he had discussed it, he would have derived it from such sensory beginnings. For though he knows how to "dramatize" most entertainingly his treatment of philosophic terms, his point of view is predominantly "scientist," rather than "dramatistic." Dramatistically, we should not derive the linguistic negative from physical repugnance. But we should note how, once such a negative has taken form, it can on many occasions so affect the body that the violating of moralistic proscriptions may produce acute bodily distress and revulsion. Dramatistically, we watch always for ways in which bodily attitudes can affect the development of linguistic expression. (We like Paget's theory of "gesture speech" for this reason.) But we also watch for notable respects in which symbolization is an order of motives not reducible to purely non-linguistic terms. In any case, however, we are not obliged to attempt disproving Mauthner's genealogy. It can be classed as another kind of "positive pre-negative." And it has the advantage of a more attitudinal beginning than our notion of the negative's start in an expression half-demonstrative, half-imperative. In fact, perhaps at this point we shift a bit to the "scientist" side, whereas Mauthner's feeling of disgust is more "dramatistic," through being incipiently "factional." See, Fritz Mauthner, *Wörterbuch der Philosophie* (Munich & Leipzig, 1910), II, 149-156.

Dramatistically, in our ideal Genealogy of the Negative, the primal ancestor would be closer to a verb than to any other part of speech. At least, it would be verbal in the sense that it had strongly *imperative* or *hortatory* connotations, and grammarians usually grant such functions only to verbal modes. Such a "pre-negative" verb could have been a mere tonal gesture for calling-attention-to. It would have been less like a negative than like the grunt-like sounds an incipiently vocal infant makes when handing something to an adult, or when asking something of an adult, or when noticing something in which it takes an interest.

This sound would come to have a deterrent or pejorative meaning because the calling of attention to *danger* is of greater significance than the calling of attention just to *something*—somewhat as our verb *look out* usually has admonitory connotations, though it need not have. Such a "verbal demonstrative" could also be well adapted to serve as a word for *one*, insofar as forty elephants can be said to constitute "one" manifestation—or, if you will, one herd. Anything, even a conglomerate, would be a "one," if conceived as a single subject. Or the same sound could convey the command "look," or "look out!" Distinctions among the usages could be suggested by changes in tone of voice.

Once this "verbal demonstrative" for "attitudinally calling-attention-to" had come to signify attention in the specifically sinister sense, it would be translatable by some such expressions as *Beware!* or *Caution!* Note that it would *not* be a negative in the *formal* sense at all. But it would have the *force* of a negative command, insofar as it implied: "Stop what you're doing," or "Change your ways of doing what you're doing."

We have postulated a pre-historical beginning of language in which a word such as *no* meant something positive like "Look at this," or "Look at that." Insofar as it called attention in the admonitory sense, while *implying* a negative it would still not be felt as an out-and-out negative command. It was as positive as any word like *run*, or *eat*, or *fight*, and the like, except that it had a hortatory nature which such words do not primarily possess. We can imagine it containing in germ a range of meanings as different as these: thou, look, don't, there, give, one, a, the, that.

However, once human speech had a positive word with admonitory connotations, it was well on the road towards the discovery of the peculiar genius implicit in the negative as such. We can thus readily imagine an intermediate stage during which the admonitory word came to function *like an auxiliary verb in the imperative*. In this stage, an expression like *man no run* would be literally translatable not as "the man does not run" or even as "the man should not run," but as "man beware run" or "man caution run." A little further along would be: "man stop run."

V. Later Steps in the Development of the Negative

Gradually the implied negative in connotations of deterrence would become the explicit negative of command. Yet between it and the propositional negative there would be intermediate stages. There would thus be an adaptation to ideas of fear. An expression like *No lions* would mean not "there are no lions," but "I fear lions" or "You should watch for lions." Here an observation on the evolution of Latin grammar stands us in good stead. Though we should ordinarily translate *timeo ne accidat* as "I fear lest it happen" or "I

fear it may happen," we read this pregnant remark in Allen and Greenough:

> With verbs of Fearing the subjunctive with *nē* is hortatory in origin: *timeō nē accidat* is literally *I fear, let it not happen*. The subjunctive with *ut* may have been either hortatory or deliberative . . .[3]

The next step would seem to involve words of *Doubt*. Here the perturbations are obvious enough even in modern English, despite its great sloughing-off of inflections. If you say in English, "I don't doubt that he won't come," one is not quite sure whether you expect him or don't expect him, though *legally* the statement says that you don't expect him.

Nevertheless terms for doubt would probably be the point at which the out-and-out propositional negative emerged. We mean that from this point on, the negative *qua* negative would be felt in a given linguistic system. It would have come of age, no longer being felt merely as a modification of admonitory verbs, but as the kind of particle used in the purely *indicative* distinction between "it is" and "it is not."

In brief, when you get to *doubt*, you're within the *scientist* area of *information*. So your next step is the outright *No* of "negative propositions" that affirm a "negative fact."

You would then be on the road to the kind of thinking that flowers in *formal definition*.

VI. "Behavioristic Pre-Language"

Implied in the use of the negative, there is both the ability to generalize and the ability to specify. That is, you cannot use the negative properly without by the same token exemplifying the two basic dialectical resources of merger and division. For you can use *no* properly only insofar as you can classify under one head many situations that are, in their positive details, quite distinct from one another. In effect, you group them under the head of "Situations all of which are classed in terms of the negative." And in the very act of so classifying, you distinguish them from another class of situations that are "*not* No-Situations."

However, classification and discrimination are not peculiarly linguistic processes. The senses classify, when they "translate" some vibrations into terms of sound, others into terms of color, or record still others as smell, etc. And insofar as each biological organism selects the kind of food proper to its species, it is in effect discriminating, making distinctions between wanted and unwanted classes of objects. The necessary limitations imposed upon a biological organism in its "act of being itself" make for a kind of "behavioristic classifying."

In this rudimentary sense, a mere paucity of sense organs is enough to make a kind of "abstraction" and "classification" inevitable. Three lambs, each with a history of unique details, become reducible to sheer mutton, when we ignore their "personal histories" and abstract from the totality of their special natures the one generic quality they possess as meat. In this respect, "behavioristic classification" is like that of scales, which can abstract and record but the one quantity, weight, and hence indifferently report a man to weigh a certain amount, whether he be a genius or an imbecile.

Since any paucity in the means of recording a given situation implies *classification* and *abstraction*, there is thus a sense in which discrimination is by

[3] *Allen and Greenough's Latin Grammar*, Rev. and Enlarged by James Bradstreet Greenough, assisted by George L. Kittredge (Boston & London, 1892), n., p. 361. According to the same grammarians, the subjunctive is the adaptation of a form originally future.

the same token lack of discrimination. For inasmuch as discrimination by abstraction and classification implies the ignoring of detailed differences among things bunched under the same head, discrimination is "insensitive." And "insensitiveness" of this sort is as observable in "behavioristic pre-language" as in language proper.

Every warm day is, in its particularity, distinct from every other warm day. But insofar as we sense it merely as "warm," we have classed it with many other days past and possible, distinguishing it grossly from a class of cool or cold days. The principle of classification here would seem to be the same as the principle embodied in behavioristic pre-language. Thus, if a dog barks on some occasions, whimpers on others, growls on others, grovels on others, and wags his tail on others, he has in effect "classified" these various *kinds* of situation.

However, inasmuch as there are many unique details of motion on each occasion, there is the possibility that we are classifying more than *he*. Each time he salivates may be for him "unique," though our linguistic approach leads us rather to class all such occasions under some such general heading as "salivation-situations." It is thus possible that sensory experience in a non-verbalizing animal allows every moment of existence to be felt as *totally new*, even as successive pairs of lovers feel that they have invented love.

When we call attention to the rudiments of generalization, specification, classification, and abstraction in the conditioning and adaptations of non-linguistic organisms, we do not mean to derive "rational" human language by a simple "graded series" from the "behavioristic pre-language" of sensation and gesture. On the contrary, we subscribe to the view that there is a "qualitative leap" between the motives of pre-language and those of language. But we are trying to narrow the gap here, in the interests of method asserting no greater differentiation than the evidence seems to justify.

We say as much while also reminding ourselves that, once a qualitative leap has been made, even those ingredients taken over from the previous structure have a new nature because of their place in a new motivational cluster. Hence, to say that the principles of abstraction, classification, generalization, and specification (or division) are present in pre-linguistic behavior is not the same as saying that their linguistic analogues are "nothing but" more complicated variants of the pre-linguistic. But we must be on guard lest, in our zeal to make much of the negative, we give too much credit to it in particular and to language in general because of the negative's attribute as a peculiarity of language.

Though we would treat the motives of a specifically language-using organism as qualitatively different from those of non-linguistic animals, hence not derivable by the *lex continui* from natural behavior and not reducible to such terms, we must even admit that there is a kind of purely behavioristic negative. Either infant or animal in effect "says no" when turning the head away from something that it does not want. Coleridge once attributed to such a source the use of the head-shake as a sign of negation. The alternative nod, to indicate assent, might have arisen as a "negation of this negation." For though either nod or head-shake serve to turn away the mouth (hence though either could serve, on this basis, as a sign for negation), the other would seem to be left for the complementary sign

of assent, as the only completely "opposite" kind of gesture available.

All told, we find ourselves steering between opposite extremes of interpretation. We want to uphold an "entelechial" interpretation of language, according to which even the simplest infantile sounds would have in them the possibilities of linguistic *fulfilment*. Their simplest *beginnings* would implicitly reveal their mature potentialities, if we were but discerning enough, so that the first "non-linguistic" cry of a language-using species could be found to contain a motivational element not present in the first cry of a non-linguistic species. At the same time, we would retain an emphasis upon the *evolutionary* processes whereby a language is built from generation to generation by gradual accretions.

Evolution-wise, we would even incline to believe that most rudiments of language were taught to adults by children, as the mother imitated the child's sounds in the efforts to communicate with him. But "entelechy-wise," we would incline to believe that *no* was the peculiarly "mature" contribution to language, the "moralistic" non-sensory "idea" that adults imposed upon children. The child's brain has to be such that any moralistic "transcending" of the sensory can gradually become understandable. In other words, there must be the "entelechial" factor that made the "evolution of no" possible. And once this feeling for the linguistic *no* is present, all sorts of words can become permeated with its genius as they accumulate with the gradual growth of language.

Though Socrates started his analysis of dialectic from the distinction between words that put things together and words that take things apart, and we note here an area where verbal dialectic and *Naturdialektik* overlap, we find reason to look for a double genesis of language. For we cannot bring ourselves to say that *words* for abstracting and classifying are "nothing but" the analogous use of such principles implicit in the selectivities of purely biological behavior.

So we glimpse here two quite distinct sources for the development of language, each of them contributing in its way to linguistic enrichment. First, there would be the "scientist" source, knowledge received or perceived through the medium of the senses in their role as bearers of information. Second, there would be a "dramatistic" source, conceived in "tribal" terms that are still to be made clear. "Abstraction" would be through the "sensory," or informative line. And "generalization" would be through the *action* line. Leibnitz's equating of *substance* with *action*, and the Spinozistic equating of *substance* with *causality* would suggest the ways whereby "generalization" would involve the "tribal." For *substance* is a thoroughly "tribal" concept; and *causality* is as "tribal" as parenthood.

Sensory abstraction would yield the simple positives, a language of things and of doings and of the sensations that we typically experience in connection with them. Dramatistic generalization would yield the "idea of the negative," the "ability to distinguish between the yes and no of 'right' and 'wrong,'" in the sense not just of avoidances (such as any animal can be conditioned to) but of a thou-shalt-not which, though originally directed at someone else, is universalized to the point where it circles back upon the self—the "tribal" thus being made total.

But since the Dramatistic-tribal negative involves "reason," we should consider more fully how it compares and contrasts with the "behavioristic prelanguage" that man, the verbalizing

species, shares with non-verbalizing kinds of natural organisms.

VII. Image and Idea

There seems to be a kind of "behavioristic pre-language" in the sounds and posturing of animals—expressions which are to some extent "interpreted" by other animals, at least to the extent that they call forth relevant changes in behavior. But when we analyze "behavior" in the strictest sense, "expectation" does not exist. For expectation involves a future, whereas behavior can only be observed in the present. Behavioristically, a state of "expectation" is identical with a set of neuro-muscular conditions *now*. Let us illustrate. Once we watched a cat that had caught a chipmunk. He was toying with it, even to the extent of letting it loose and looking away, only to reach out an expert paw at the last moment just as the victim, taking new heart, seemed about to escape. As this incident was repeated several times, the chipmunk gradually edged nearer to a tree. Finally, victim and tormentor were both so near the tree that, when the chipmunk was again released, he made a dash for it, and by climbing it spiral-wise, escaped. Whereupon the cat lifted its head, looked straight at its master, and gave a most emphatic yowl. Here was decidedly a change from an "is" situation to an "is not" situation. *So far as the logical diagram of the case was concerned*, the chipmunk first *was*, and then *wasn't*. But behavioristically, what you had was simply each positive motion, in exactly that positive order, including, of course, unseen motions that must have occurred within the body when the "salivation-situation" was suddenly replaced by the new austerity-situation. We might say that the second situation "negated" the first. But as regards behavior there was no negative, for there could not be: every step of the way was an engrossing positive.

Such stories prove nothing in themselves. But they do help make clear that there is a qualitative distinction between the sensory (rooted in the images of "behavioristic pre-language") and the rational (rooted in the ideas of language proper).

The empiricist strategy would account for an idea such as "whiteness" along nominalist lines, as a summarizing word got by abstracting the single quality of "white" from the perception of many different white things. It would reduce the "idea" to an "image." The Dramatist strategy would (though covly) incline to the realist side, where "whiteness" would be thought of as an "activity," a way of belonging to one kind or family of color, rather than belonging to some other family of color (with its particular tribal nature or "substance"). Here the "image" (of any particular white thing) would owe its meaning as a *word* to its participation in the "idea of whiteness in general."

Obviously, the distinction between sensory (imaginal) abstraction and rational (ideal) generalization must be lost almost as soon as it is made, quite as we often use the two words *abstraction* and *generalization* interchangeably. And if *both* idea and image contribute to the development of language, we can expect to find each influencing the other. A distinction between mother and father ultimately involves substantial relationships; but it must begin in purely sensory perceptions, distinctions in the sensory ways by which the two relatives manifest themselves.

Empiricist reduction of idea to image is particularly deceptive because of the ways in which it conceals the social animus contained in sensations. And "Dramatism" aims always to make us sensitive to the "ideas" lurking in

"things," which might even as social motives seem reducible to their sheerly material nature, unless we can perfect techniques for disclosing their "enigmatic" or "emblematic" dimension.

Though idea and image have become merged in the development of language, the negative provides the instrument for splitting them apart. *For the negative is an idea;* there can be no image of it. *But in imagery there is no negative.*

Here, recalling Bergson's just and penetrating observations on "the idea of 'nothing,'" we might distinguish between "the idea of nothing" and "the idea of no." If you would form an idea of nothing, you require an image—and, as Bergson points out, an image must be of something. But you need no image to form an idea of no. All you need is to "get the drift," to understand in what sort of situations you would employ this particular linguistic function. For "ideas" don't have to be of "things." If, for instance, you learn how to use the expletive "there," in a sentence like "There are many men here," you "get the idea." You might try to picture the many men, but you would not try to picture the expletive.

The negative is not picturable, though it can be *indicated*—as by a head-shake, or the mathematical mark for minus, or the word *no*. It is properly shown by a *sign*, not by an *image*. For a "negative image" would be a contradiction in terms. Even a photographic "negative" is "positive," so far as its effect upon the retina of the eye is concerned. Its negativity derives from our *ideas* of its place in a total purposive process, involving "expectation."

Spinoza stresses that if you would imaginally cancel the effects of one image, you can do so only by introducing a stronger image. In effect, he is saying that there is no negative in imagery. The negative is in the realm of *idea*. And its "rational" nature is implicit in Spinoza's stress upon the "adequate idea" as the means to freedom of action.

If we take the image as devoid of negatives, and the idea as the realm of the negative, we glimpse in Spinoza very remarkable transformations of the tribal thou-shalt-not. First, we recall that by him the *positive* world is characterized by "negation." For the world of our positive, natural sensations is determined; and in Spinoza's central formula all determination is negation. Such a determined world is, by the same token, inevitably, a realm of "necessity." In this respect, note that it is what we might call a realm of "natural *command*," with thou-shalt-not's supplied, not by authority, but by the nature of things. We thus glimpse the possibility that part of its "negativity" may derive from its nature as a cosmologizing of the Tribal No.

Yet this Tribal No resides basically in the realm not of sensory image, but of super-sensory idea. If sensation is the realm of motion, idea is the realm of action. And action is possible only insofar as the rational agent transcends the realm of sheer motion—sensory image. He does so, however, by forming adequate ideas of the limitations defining this sensory realm. And insofar as his understanding of the world's necessities approaches perfection, he is correspondingly free: he can *act*, rather than merely being *moved*, or "affected." But just as one cannot keep the sensory and the rational kinds of classification distinct, so the essential nolessness of image becomes confused with the essential no of the rational-tribal idea. Hence, though the injunction, "Thou shalt not kill" is in essence an *idea*, in its role as *imagery* it can but strike the resonant gong: "Kill!"

VIII. Reason, Understanding, Imagination, Fancy

Approaching the traditional reason-imagination pair in terms of the negative, we find them distinguishable thus: Reason is the ability to use the negative *qua* negative, the moralistic equivalent being "the ability to distinguish between right and wrong"; and it either is or is not—there being a difference in kind between the presence or absence of reason. But imagination, having no negative, induces or deters by changes of intensity; its presence or absence are thus a matter of degree.

We must hasten to qualify this statement. It applies to the typical classical relation between the two terms. In classical usage, imagination is a "low" faculty which humans share with brutes. But in romantic usage, imagination is often a higher faculty than reason, for in this usage it transcends mere image, though the transcendence is through the cultivation of images. The "aesthetic" in Kant is sensory; the "idea" is rational; but a term such as *the aesthetic idea* applied to works of art sets up possibilities whereby imagination in general and artistic imagination in particular can be said to possess the highest synthesizing powers—the direction completed in Schelling.

Coleridge treats the situation thus: In the *Biographia Literaria,* when dealing with poetry, he uses a fancy-imagination pair; in *The Friend,* when dealing with philosophy, he uses an understanding-reason pair. Fancy is close to mere sensation in the poetic realm. And understanding is the correspondingly lower term in the philosophic realm. Fancy in poetry is to understanding in philosophy as imagination in poetry is to reason in philosophy or theology. Hence as regards our previous distinction: reason is something that one either has or does not have, as one either sees or does not see a joke; and understanding is the kind of accumulative factual knowledge one can have more or less of. The presence-or-absence element figures in poetic imagination mainly through Coleridge's equating of wholeness with imagination; and the matter of quantity or degree in fancy figures mainly as an equating of fancy with the mechanistically motivated.

Obviously, there are dialectical transformations whereby, within a given controlled system, a "low" word can become of the highest. And we are not here trying to argue for or against any such usage, except insofar as we hold that one's analysis of such terms should begin with the classical distinction between sensation and reason, a distinction which we would reduce to a feeling for the negative as such. Since we take it that the negative is not (in Kantian terms) either a "sensation" or a "concept," at least so far as its beginnings *in the imperative* are concerned, we class it as an "idea"; hence, again in Kantian terms, we situate its essential function in the "dialectic" of "reason."

Therefore, all we ask is that you consent to *enter* the field by this route. Look at any house, and the house you see is the "image" of that house. Call it a house, and you have given it its appropriate "concept." But the "idea" of a house is not empirically reproducible. As Kant puts it, ". . . we can have no knowledge of an object, which perfectly corresponds to an idea, although we may possess a problematical conception thereof."[4]

Glimpse the admonitory motive lurking within that term, *problematical.* You are thereby discerning the pressure

[4] Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason,* tr. by J. M. D. Meiklejohn (London, 1890), Transcendental Dialectic, Bk. II, Of the Dialectical Procedure of Pure Reason, pp. 235-236.

of the moralistic *Critique of Practical Reason,* ambiguously proclaiming its genius behind and beyond the quasi-intellectualistic *Critique of Pure Reason.* You are glimpsing from afar the Essential No at the roots of the Categorical Imperative.

IX. In Sum

In analyzing the negative we arrive at these various distinctions:

(1) Primitive positives, as with the animal taking what it wants.

(2) Primitive negatives, as with the animal turning away from what it doesn't want, or what it wants but fears to take—or is "conditioned" not to take.

Since (1) and (2) are aspects of "behavioristic pre-language," they are not *bona fide* positive and negative in the peculiarly linguistic sense. Indeed, the turning-away is as "positive" an operation as the "taking," so far as its sheer materiality is concerned.

(3) There are rational or dramatist positives, in the sense that the intelligent carrying-out of an act for an intelligent purpose is positive.

From the standpoint of (3) both (1) and (2) are called negative, insofar as "enslavement" to the "necessities" of "the senses" is a "negation" of "freedom."

(4) There is the linguistic positive of words like *stop, caution, look out,* which have negative *implications* insofar as they are admonitory or deterrent in meaning. For such meanings can be phrased outright as negative command, once such a grammatical form is available.

(5) There are the out-and-out negatives, ranging from "thou shalt not" to "it is not."

And our main point is: Once the Perfect Negatives of (5) have taken form, their genius permeates the motivations of the other four. For instance, whereas one might otherwise want to treat "Yea" simply as a combination of primitive positives (1) and rational positives (3), we would admonish always to look for respects in which it might more accurately be treated as a negating of No.

A perfect illustration of our point is Nietzsche's nihilistic cult of Yea-saying. Nietzsche was trying to say no to the customary ways in which we say yes to the tribal thou-shalt-not's. His stylistic tactics involved him in exhorting us to cultivate a realm of primitive-positive motives.

But the primitivism was false. His Zarathustra was in essence as admonitory as a Hebrew prophet. And what more perfectly symbolizes the negativism of his perception than Zarathustra's poem on the striking of the clock at midnight? Each of the first eleven strokes has its corresponding sentence. But, when we get to the stroke of twelve (the all-important moment of *fulfilment)* the expected completion is missing. Precisely where the form attains its culmination, its symmetry is broken.

Eins! O Mensch, gib acht!
Zwei! Was spricht die tiefe Mitternacht?
Drei! "Ich schlief, ich schlief—
Vier! "Aus tiefem Traum bin ich erwacht!
Fünf! "Die Welt ist tief—
Sechs! "Und tiefer, als der Tag gedacht.
Sieben! "Tief ist ihr Weh,—
Acht! "Lust—tiefer noch als Herzeleid!
Neun! "Weh spricht: Vergeh!
Zehn! "Doch alle Lust will Ewigkeit—,
Elf! "—Will tiefe, tiefe Ewigkeit!"
Zwölf![5]

The "revelation" in the twelfth line is

[5] Friedrich Nietzsche, "Das Andere Tanzlied," in *Also Sprach Zarathustra* (Stuttgart, co. 1930), Dritter Teil, p. 253.

in the very negating of the form which we had been led by the pattern of the previous eleven lines to expect. And through this *perfection* of the surprise ending, we may glimpse the genius of the negative lurking in all surprise, when used as a device of literary form.

Nietzsche's greatest insight concerned the ways in which positive-seeming acts can be concealments of the great Tribal negatives. For the astounding genius of the negative includes its ability to manifest itself in disciplinary disguise. Ironically, his discoveries can also be carried to the point where we never lose sight of the moralistic negatives underlying his nihilistic cult of the primitive-positive.

Once you have society, with the thou-shalt-not's indigenous to its order, there can be no primitive positives. Those who kill themselves with eating doubtless do so in the belief that they are motivated by sheer physical appetite. And physical appetite is probably the nearest to a primitive positive we can come, outside the inevitable positiveness of physical development from childhood to old age, with perhaps only the years between twenty-one and forty being thought of as wholly positive, in our culture. But insofar as physical appetite is *compensatory* (insofar as one over-eats because one feels frustrated in some other area of expression or "has nothing else to do") here are the same negativistic motives crowding in on the supposedly most positive behavior of all.

With regard to the erotic motive, the simplest way to realize how far it is from the primitive positive is to walk about Times Square, looking at the advertisements for the "nature in the raw" movies regularly being shown there. In an environment far from the "natural," the posters blatantly proclaim a cult of what is supposedly sheer natural sexuality, depictions of violent sexual heat in a welter of imported jungle-imagery. Of course, you might say that the cult of "nature" here is attained through sheer reaction to the excessive unnaturalness of the city. But we question whether "nature" is so easily won. And we would ask instead whether people so unnaturally surrounded could accurately appreciate anything truly "natural." In either case, one will grant that the appeal of such quasi "primitive-positives" is largely in their expression of imaginary trespass upon the thou-shalt-not's of private, sexual property.

In sum, however positive sexual potency *in itself* may be, we should always distinguish between it and a *cult* of sexual potency. The "I can" of the cult (as distinguished from the "I can" of the sheer material condition) involves thou-shalt-not's of private property that have only a remote and roundabout connection with sex as such, however enjoyable in its sheer material positiveness sexual coupling may be.

Yet the mention of private property brings up another point. We have already indicated, and shall later consider more fully, how moral negatives can become positives through universalization. For if everybody were in debt to everybody, to this extent nobody would owe anybody. At least, the indebtedness would cancel out, so far as sheer mathematics is concerned. But we must consider a twist whereby the genius of the moral negative, as thus made positive, can add a new kind of negativity, in the very midst of its positivizing. For if everybody has something that he would keep for himself, to the exclusion of everybody else, to this extent everybody is guilty with regard to everybody, so that the accumulation of such positive possessions adds up to universal indebtedness. In such straits, the individual debtor may seek no less than Nietzschean consolations for his discomfitures; and

like Nietzsche, he may persuade himself that such negations-atop-negations-atop-negations are a rediscovery of primitive positives, somewhat as though bathing beauties on the beach were there sunning themselves just like turtles, and not as candidates for preferment.

In the terms of our present inquiry, "Reason" differs from "Conscience" in that "Reason" translates Yea and Nay as True and False, "Conscience" translates them as Right and Wrong. But since the Yeas of Conscience are headed in a code of Negative Commandments, techniques for "mortification" of "the senses" can be developed by conscientious priesthoods who would transform the negatives of guilty trespass into a corresponding regimen of "positive" athleticism. For since all acts have the positiveness of being what they are in their sheer materiality, a schematically penitential mode of living has positiveness of this sort; yet, implicit in its motivation, there is the admonitory genius of self-punishment.

Beyond such modes of cancellation as prevail in penance, mortification, and pietistic or Puritanical austerity of living, we catch a glimpse of the debt-negative, that apparently contributed to the development of the minus-sign in mathematics. In failing to abide by the tribal or institutional thou-shalt-not's, or in fearing that one might fail, one piles up a measure of guilt after the analogy of a debt that needs repayment by corresponding positive sums. One here sees how the religious sin-penance pair, the secular debit-credit pair, and the plus-and-minus of mathematics all share ultimately in the same motivational cluster.

Zero is the negating of any plus. What, then, of minus? Is it a kind of super-negation or sub-negation, in turn to be negated by a compensatory plus that brings us to zero? In any case, as regards the special realm of moral debt, there can be a moment when the sheer cancellation of such a heavy minus is a kind of zero that *positively levitates*. For just as a man carrying a burden on his back might fall forward if it were suddenly released, so freedom from guilt, like freedom from debt or responsibility, can be felt as buoyancy.

Accordingly, any authoritative constraint, willingly accepted, that negates guilt or temptation by a regimen of "positive Law" (if we may wrench a term egregiously from its usual usage) can be felt as "freedom." And freedom is the most "positive" of all experiences, despite the obvious negatives in the word itself, which should prompt us always to ask, "Freedom *from what?*"

Victimage is another variant of the negative lurking in a quasi-positive. For the victim is positively there, in the most thoroughly materialistic sense. Yet insofar as the victim is a scapegoat, being symbolically or ritually laden by the victimizer with the guilt of the victimizer, he is a positive-seeming vessel of the victimizer's conscience-ridden response to the Great Negations of his tribe. "Our sins, in all their negativity as regards our tendency to trespass upon the thou-shalt-not's, are positively out there, in the enemy. Let us organize against them!" What could be more sanctimonious a sanction?

We hope to develop later the analytic terms that will disclose many more areas in which the negative is operating, however positive they may seem on their face. And we hope to show further developments of the motives we have already considered.

(To be continued)

POLITICAL SPEAKING IN 1952: A SYMPOSIUM

A. Craig Baird

THIS symposium, a venture in contemporary rhetorical criticism, is an attempt to understand and analyze political speaking as it occurs in our own times. The hazards of the venture are doubtless too obvious to require elaboration. If the advantages that might accrue are less obvious, they are believed to be no less genuine.

In organizing the symposium, I have sought the collaboration of some of the outstanding younger critics of speechmaking and some who are widely known to the profession. In each instance I have endeavored to obtain the help of a critic who either had or would create the opportunity to witness speeches from the platform as well as by radio and television. I have enlisted the support of men whose training and scholarship might reasonably lead one to expect measured and objective judgment; yet I have not asked any contributor to undertake a task to which his sympathies would not naturally incline him.

The symposium concerns the convention and pre-convention speaking of the leading candidates of the major parties, with the exception of the speaking done by and for Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Stevenson, which will be the subject of an article in a forthcoming issue of *QJS*. In presenting the material, I have set forth first the analysis of the Republican convention, since it preceded the Democratic, and followed the study of each convention with a critical review of the speechmaking of the major candidates presented to it.

For the account of the Republican convention we are indebted to Kenneth G. Hance, Professor of Public Speaking, and to Martin J. Maloney, Associate Professor of Radio and Television, School of Speech, Northwestern University. Professors Hance and Maloney had the advantage of being in Chicago during the convention and of consulting the work-sheets of the Television Monitoring Project of the Department of Radio and Television, School of Speech, Northwestern University, which held the Republican convention under constant study. For the account of the Democratic convention we are indebted to J. Jeffery Auer, Professor of Speech, the University of Virginia. Through the courtesy of members of the Democratic National Committee, Professor Auer attended the convention as the representative of *QJS*. The criticisms of the speechmaking of the candidates were contributed as follows: *Douglas MacArthur*, by Winton H. Beaven, the University of Michigan; *Harold E. Stassen*, by Gordon F. Hostettler, Temple University; *Robert A. Taft*, by Warren Guthrie, Western Reserve University; *Earl Warren*, by W. Charles Redding, University of Southern California; *Alben W. Barkley*, by C. A. Leistner, Oberlin College; *W. Averell Harriman*, by Hollis L. White, Queens College; *Estes Kefauver*, by Waldo W. Braden, Louisiana State University; *Robert S. Kerr*, by John W. Keltner and R. Victor Harnack, the University of Oklahoma;

Mr. Baird (B.A., Wabash, 1907; B.D., Union Theological Seminary, 1910; M.A., Columbia, 1912; Litt. D., Wabash, 1931) is Professor of Speech, State University of Iowa.

Richard B. Russell, by Gregg Phifer, Florida State University. The contributors should receive the credit due them for the merits of their criticisms. They are not responsible for the exigencies of publishing which have required some cutting in all of the analyses and considerable cutting in several.

I. THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

At 7:10 p.m., on Wednesday evening, July 9, the delegates to the Republican Convention reconvened in the International Amphitheatre, in Chicago, to hear the report of the Credentials Committee on the seating of the delegations from Georgia and Texas. The assembly was tense and rather unruly. Individual debates across the hall were stilled only momentarily during the invocation. Permanent Chairman Joseph Martin, of Massachusetts, arose to deliver his set speech.

As it turned out, this was a tactical error. Chairman Martin's address was a well-composed political ritual alleging that inter-planetary travel, the two-way wrist radio, and cheap beef would follow close on the heels of a Republican victory in November. At another time such a speech would almost surely have been well received, but with an issue before them the delegates could not be bothered with ritual. As Martin began to speak, Governors Dewey, Fine, Lodge, and Adams, and Representative Judd, together with a sizeable number of reporters, joined in a noisy conference in front of the rostrum.

In combination the tumult of the governors and the reaction of the delegates were too much for Martin's temper and vocal cords. He halted several times, apparently in anger and confusion, once seized the gavel to hammer for order, and finally gained reinforcement from Temporary Chairman Walter Hallanan. The efforts of the two men were all but fruitless; however, Martin finally concluded his speech, and the convention got down to the business of the evening: the debate on the majority and minority reports of the Credentials Committee. The proponents of the minority report were permitted to present their case first.

Donald W. Eastvold, a young man from Washington, was recognized by the chair. His speaking provided a complete contrast to the Martin-Dewey upheaval. Calmly and pleasantly he outlined some fourteen arguments in support of his position, presented evidence to substantiate several of them, and moved the adoption of the minority report as a substitute motion. He spoke for about twelve minutes and sat down.

Hallanan then recognized Gordon X. Richmond, of California, who picked up the case where Eastvold had left it and developed some further arguments. Other speakers followed, piecing out the same pattern: a calm, deliberative development of a carefully reasoned case.

At 9:40 p.m. quite another phenomenon appeared. The chair recognized Senator Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, who for twenty-four minutes indulged in eloquence. "I wish to do nothing," he said, "that will impair our chances in November. I will support the candidate of this convention, whoever he is, and I will urge you not to permit passion and momentary hysteria to set a roadblock in the path of what looks like certain victory in November." As Dirksen spoke, he was interrupted by recurrent cheers and boos—the boos predom-

inating. The interruptions seemed to anger the Senator, for he turned abruptly from his earlier course of conciliation to address chiefly the Pennsylvania and New York delegations. To the New Yorkers he said: "When Dewey was the candidate in 1944 and 1948, I went into twenty-three states and fought for him. Re-examine your hearts on this issue because we followed you before, and you took us down the road to defeat!" As the Senator completed this appeal, a delegate fainted; several other delegates (believing he had been struck down by the opposition) rushed to his rescue; a news photographer was slugged from behind; and the small-scale riot which ensued had to be broken up by the police.[1]

We have described this sequence of events in detail because it provides a useful key to the understanding of the Republican convention of 1952. This convention presented a study in *contrasts,* in terms of which the rhetorical critic must make his analysis. In the debate on the report of the Credentials Committee, and particularly in the opposed figures of Eastvold and Dirksen, we have a microcosm of the Convention itself.

What were the salient contrasting features of this clash? On the one hand, we may observe these characteristics: youth, an impression of brevity (actually a function of the methodical organization of the Eastvold case), attention to the issues under debate, systematic development of a portion of the total case, careful integration of the speeches (the entire case for the minority report was carefully organized as a unit, into which each individual speech was fitted), focus upon the immediate audience of delegates, and a type of delivery commonly termed "direct." On the other hand: age—or at least greater seniority within the party, an impression of considerably less brevity, less attention to the issues at hand, a tendency to speak to subjects and issues not under debate, an evident concern to speak "for the record," and a type of delivery commonly termed "oratorical."

We have perhaps stated these contrasts somewhat more sharply than the evidence would justify. Yet in the main we believe that this characterization of the Eastvold-Dirksen debate is accurate, and that our description of this contrast becomes still more accurate when extended to the whole convention. Indeed, the pattern we have begun to describe became apparent to television viewers during the first afternoon of the convention, when the so-called "Fair-Play Amendment" came up for consideration. The issues involved in this debate were rapidly absorbed into the Eisenhower-Taft contest: anyone who viewed or listened to the early sessions of the Convention might roughly have equated the terms "Eisenhower—television—fair-play—debate" on the one hand, and the terms "Taft—anti-television—anti-fair-play—oratory" on the other. In the interests of accuracy we should not care to endorse these rough equations; for instance, some "oratory" emanated from the Eisenhower camp, and some "debate" from Senator Taft's supporters. Yet the backers of General Eisenhower, having seized upon the attempted ban on radio and television coverage as a kind of moral issue (television people in Chicago were soon referring to the "Eisenhower-morality axis"), proceeded to make excellent use of the new medium. On at least one

[1] The foregoing description of the Eastvold-Dirksen debate was drawn from reports in the press for July 10, 1952, and from the work-sheets of the Television Monitoring Project of the Department of Radio and Television, School of Speech, Northwestern University, for July 9, 1952.

occasion they abruptly moved to recess a committee hearing when the television cameras shut off for the night; on another, they timed their activities so that the big struggle over contested delegations would come at a time of maximum viewing; and, according to Henry Cabot Lodge, they deliberately chose younger, better-looking men to carry their message to the television audience.[2] On the other hand, the Taft forces attempted to bar television from committee hearings, consistently annoyed and alienated television personnel, and offered to the viewer a long parade of party ancients who, when they spoke, uttered little but Grade A wisdom, appropriate to all occasions.

If we were to classify the speakers of the Convention under such labels as "the young debaters" as contrasted to "the elder statesmen," we should certainly put such men as Driscoll, Judd, Lodge, McKeldin, and Thornton into the former group, and Dirksen, Martin, and MacArthur into the latter. In general, these classifications would fit the Eisenhower and Taft camps, respectively, although there would be exceptions on both sides; for instance, Attorney General Vernon Thompson and Eugene Worrell, of the Taft group. In political conventions, nominating and set speeches are largely ritualistic, and speeches on issues arising out of the business of the party are deliberative. Yet when some speakers (Governor Pyle, of Arizona, for example) delivered a set speech, they tended to be more like the "young debaters," and when the "elder statesmen" rose to debate, they lapsed into "oratory."

The simple existence of such sharp contrast in speech styles is in itself interesting; the larger significance of the contrast is even more interesting. *It may be said that the character of the speaking at this Convention is the most important clue to the character of the Convention itself.* What, therefore, does this contrast signify? Evidently, a split within the party which can well be considered with reference to four factors.

The first of these factors is the preference noted above for youth or for age in speakers. The spokesmen for the "young debaters" were generally young, those for the "elder statesmen" generally elderly.

The second factor is a decided difference in attitude regarding political tactics which we may phrase in the words: advertising men versus politicians. Let us develop this idea. Governor Dewey, widely acclaimed by the press as the "kingmaker," the chief strategist of the Eisenhower group, symbolizes the former concept. The Governor's basic concept of political tactics—at least where public appearances are involved—is like that of an advertising executive. His performance during the 1948 campaign testifies to this fact, as does his skillful use of radio and television during his subsequent gubernatorial campaign. Although we must resort to inference, the influence of Dewey and of Dewey's advisers was probably responsible for the selection of young men as speakers, for the brevity of the speeches, for the calculated manipulation of debate to suit television viewing, for the generally skillful packaging of the Eisenhower campaign. On the other hand, Taft's advisers were undoubtedly politicians by trade, a fact which may account for their reliance on political rituals and conventional techniques which did not fit the realities of the 1952 Convention.

This observation leads us to the third

[2] We are indebted to Mr. George Arms, of Kansas State College, who worked as assistant television director of NBC during the Convention period, for these observations.

factor. Apparently a division of opinion existed concerning the function of nominating conventions. One group seemed to conceive of this convention as a deliberative body, intended to debate issues, to form policy, to nominate candidates, all through open procedure. The other group appeared to regard the occasion as one for political ritual—at least, for the sections of the convention which were available to the public. Accordingly the first group, which we may equate roughly with the Eisenhower supporters, favored free public access via press, radio, and television to all activities of the convention, adopted a style of deliberative speaking, and adapted their total performance to the presence of an invisible but nation-wide public. The second group, quite reasonably in the light of their assumptions, felt that the actual business of the convention should be conducted in secret, by deal or fiat, and that the public aspects of the convention should be devoted to ritual: to extolling the virtues of the party, to reliving the past, to fulfilling the traditional but non-functional public activities of conventions, and to emphasizing party pieties and party loyalties.

The fourth factor, an inevitable corollary of the contrasting concepts of convention purpose, was a difference in the concept of appropriate speech styles. Perhaps the conventional terms *deliberative* and *epideictic* will serve here. The practical difference was that between a willingness to debate issues and a desire to invoke the symbols of party loyalty.

The Republican Convention of 1952 thus developed a genuine and basic disagreement in attitudes which goes far beyond the simple issues under debate. The struggle in this Convention was not like a struggle between two men of similar loyalties who disagree over the interpretation of facts, or over policy. It was, rather, like a struggle of humans versus Martians. The members of the two opposing camps were different *kinds* of people, even to physical differences (those of youth and age). They differed over political tactics. They differed about the kind of business they were doing. They differed sharply over the degree of public participation which might be permitted in their business. These differences appear to be detailed and fundamental.

In effect, the "young debaters" won the day in Chicago. General Eisenhower is certainly not the candidate of the party stalwarts. The Eisenhower campaign will thus presumably be set to fit the attitudes and techniques of the younger group. We may see an attempt to "package and sell" General Eisenhower to the public. At another level of campaigning, we may see a willingness to debate issues "logically" and "rationally," rather than a willingness to invoke symbols.

As these lines are written, the campaign is not yet under way. Whether the predictions outlined above will prove correct, we cannot know. Assuming that they are correct, we do not know how well they will serve the Eisenhower Republicans. The American public did not respond well to an attempt to "package and sell" Governor Dewey in 1948. But perhaps Dewey and the other campaign strategists will have learned something useful in the interim. They have, at least, one major triumph behind them in their victory at the 1952 Republican Convention.

II. THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES

Douglas MacArthur

Probably no man in America in modern times has made a more dramatic speech than the one General MacArthur delivered before the Joint Session of the Congress in April, 1951. Certainly none has inspired so much "criticism," in the broad sense of the term.[3] And because that speech has been so thoroughly discussed, it is, perhaps, wise in evaluating the speaking effectiveness of the General in the campaign year to ignore it altogether.

During the fifteen months between his homecoming speech and the Republican National Convention in July, MacArthur delivered seven major addresses in such widely scattered cities as Houston, Boston, Cleveland, Jackson, Mississippi, and Lansing, Michigan. For all of them he appeared in full uniform and read from carefully prepared manuscript. He limited himself to one major speech in any particular area. Many of the concepts and ideas which appeared in his defense before Congress reappeared in these major addresses, although rarely in the same words. Throughout these speeches seemed to appear a definite progression of increasing bitterness toward the administration and of an increasing partisan political attitude. However, at no time before the convention in any of his addresses did he definitely and irrevocably label himself a Republican. In his keynote speech in civilian garb for the first time he confessed to a lifelong allegiance to the Republican party.

In assessing the speaking effectiveness of General MacArthur, to separate the "speaking" from the bias of the listeners is almost impossible. From a certain minority in almost all areas of the country he inspired a fanatic loyalty and response. Others considered him an autocratic general whose every action was suspect. Personal observation, both in face-to-face speaking and over television, seemed to indicate a much more favorable response from the older generation than the younger.

Certain characteristics of MacArthur's speaking seem incontrovertible. In delivery, he is a master. With very little gesture he reads from manuscript with great skill and power. Occasionally he lifts a hand with a half-arm gesture or taps a finger or a hand. But always he makes effective use of his microphone. So perfect is his reading skill that he never made a significant stumble; so well did he familiarize himself with his manuscript that he was always in absolute control of his delivery and maintained eye-contact with his audience as much as half the time during an address. In his keynote address he was ready for each burst of applause; it appeared to have been practised. His voice was deep and clear on most occasions, though a slight huskiness characterized the convention address. Always it carried strong emotional overtones capable of producing strong emotional responses. A flexible instrument capable of varied shades of meaning, it was particularly effective in the lower registers. Emphasis was always subdued and controlled but vigorous: the General gave the impression of speaking from the depths of strong feeling held under vigorous control. Plosives were particularly emphatic; words such as *stagger, whiplash, flaunted, proved,* and the like, fairly crackled as they exploded. For particular emphasis he used two devices: one was a vigorous

[3] Frederick Haberman, "General MacArthur's Speech: A Symposium of Critical Comment," *QJS*, XXXVII (October 1951), 321-331. Philip Wylie, "Medievalism and the MacArthurian Legend," *QJS*, XXXVII (December 1951), 473-478. Paul R. Beall, "Viper-Crusher Turns Dragon-Slayer," *QJS*, XXXVIII (February 1952), 51-56.

repeated side to side shake of the head with such words as "those reckless men," the other a pumping motion of the upper torso from the waist, executed on the balls of the feet and repeated six to eight times in rapid succession as the general reached a climax. The pace was always measured. The only noticeable delivery weakness was a tendency on some words to an s-whistle. In the main, so excellent was the delivery that even political enemies praised it.

In style and arrangement of his speeches MacArthur excelled. Introductions were brief, usually personal. Conclusions were equally short, often merely two or three sentences. Never were they summaries; always they were suggestive appeals to action, and often the Deity was mentioned. Composition could be described as tight or compact; rarely was a word wasted. Transitions were clear, even when implied. Certain stylistic devices were particularly notable. The use of refrain was especially effective; for instance, in the keynote speech successive paragraphs began with "they view with dismay"; later successive sentences began "it ignores—it ignores." Parallel construction was also apparent; successive phrases began "we practically invited—we deliberately withdrew—we recklessly yielded." These devices, rather than appearing forced, served to heighten the address and to produce greater impact of idea. As a coiner of powerful phrases the General has thus far been unequalled in this election year. Rhythm of composition was particularly noticeable; it was not "Churchillian," but possessed a quality all its own. Undoubtedly it was produced with great care; yet as delivered it did not "smell of the lamp."[4] Very long sentences, a paragraph in length, are typical of the MacArthur style, yet so carefully are they constructed that as delivered their meaning is immediately transparent. Balance and proportion are notable both in composition of sentences and in the overall composition and arrangement of the entire speech. The choice of words indicated at times a military background; the language was not always simple, but understanding of ideas did not seem impaired. The style approaches eloquence.

In the area of invention the critic finds his greatest difficulty. The problem is magnified by the fact that all phases of invention are involved; and all divisions of invention in this case are affected by the ethical appeal of the speaker.

No more controversial character lives in America today than Douglas MacArthur. He is undoubtedly a brilliant man; he has an excellent military record. Beyond that all is chaos. To his adherents he is magnetic, handsome, charming, colorful, persuasive, a military genius and prophet, a statesman without peer. Douglas MacArthur speaks with a strong tone of personal authority, poise, and dignity. For those who believe in him, his ethical and pathetic appeals are unmatched by those of any living speaker.

On the other hand, for those who believe the General to be an egomaniac with a "God" complex, an authoritarian who strives for the sole spotlight and who tolerates no disagreement, his ethical appeal is entirely negative and his emotional appeals are considered to be merely acting. He has been described as a consummate "ham."

For most people, there seems to be little middle ground in the controversy. Historically, MacArthur's career has demonstrated all the aforementioned

[4] A United Press Dispatch of July 2 indicated that the first draft of the keynote address was written in longhand at least a week before its delivery, and thereafter polished and revised.

qualities in varying degrees. If one accepts him as sincere, then his speeches, which have strong moral and religious overtones, are persuasive rallying cries to a people seeking a leader. If one believes him to be seeking high office as a wronged man, then his appeals are meaningless.

In the realm of logic, MacArthur's speaking is subject to question. All his speeches cover vast areas of subject matter. They are filled with generalizations, seldom supported by evidence, and by personal assertions which apparently are to be accepted because of the prestige of the speaker. Apparent inconsistencies and contradictions arise, such as calls for a return to the good old days of peace and tranquility, and at the same time advocacy of a policy in Korea that apparently would spread a local into a global war. But most of the definitive criticism of the General's ideas would seem to depend on the course of history to prove him right or wrong. Certainly, since his defense before Congress, his ideas relative to the Far East have stood up as well as those of his critics.

In his keynote speech MacArthur demonstrated his ability to handle a specialized kind of public address. Traditionally such a speech has as its purpose the unification of the party. The keynote speaker normally accomplishes this feat by pointing out all the sins of the opposing party and outlining all the virtues of his own. General MacArthur presented a thoroughly comprehensive indictment of the Democratic party and, at least temporarily, focused the attention of the Republicans upon their common enemy. He did not, however, extoll the Republican party. Although the speech was not as dramatic as his defense before Congress, it was a partisan address calculated to stir party enthusiasm, and at the same time produce a patriotic appeal. It did not appear calculated to advance the cause of any particular candidate for the nomination. It was not as overwhelmingly successful as, for instance, Alben Barkley's speech at Philadelphia in 1948, but it produced an excellent response.

The final evaluation of MacArthur as a speaker in 1952 can not yet be written. Undoubtedly his ideas have found a dramatic response in the hearts of many. Certainly his style and delivery have interested, even captivated, many listeners. Without question he has been an effective spokesman against the Administration and has served to vitalize and focus the Republican attack upon the Democratic power.

Harold E. Stassen

At the conclusion of the telecast in which Mr. Stassen announced his candidacy for the 1952 Republican nomination, viewers in Philadelphia were startled as they read a local station's advertisement for another program: "Next Week—Meet the Champ." The ironic juxtaposition seemed to forecast the outcome of the former Governor's campaign.

On the eve of the Republican convention, after five months of campaigning, Stassen could claim but 26 delegates, and 24 of these were in Minnesota, where he had run as a "favorite son."[5] He had placed second, third, and even fifth in primaries where he had won important victories or had been in serious contention in 1948. Voters in New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Nebraska, West Virginia, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania had refused him primary endorsements, and in all these states, excepting the last four, he had actively campaigned. He carried only Minnesota, where he was

[5] He gained one delegate in the New Jersey primary and another in the Colorado convention.

the sole name on the ballot; and even here he could achieve but a mere plurality, with the combined vote for Eisenhower and Taft exceeding his own.[6] *Time* summarized the results of his efforts when it declared, ". . . The one Republican to beat in April 1948 is the one Republican already beaten in April 1952."[7] James Reston, the *New York Times* critic, added, "He has lost more ground in four years than probably any other Presidential candidate in his generation, and he knows it."[8]

What factors account for this decline? How shall we explain the marked contrast between Stassen's fortunes in 1948 and 1952? Several answers suggest themselves: (1) the former Governor lacked effective organizational support within his party, (2) largely as a result of his own actions, his candidacy was never successfully divorced from that of General Eisenhower, and (3) he failed to offer the kind of "liberal" program which had proved so effective in his 1948 campaign.

A defeated aspirant in 1948, Stassen controlled few, if any, state committeemen. Out of public office, he commanded no patronage and the influence that accompanies it. Indeed, according to one writer, his 1948 campaign served to alienate almost all major factions in the Republican party. In that year he earned the enmity of Senator Taft when he invaded Ohio, and he broke with the Dewey and Warren forces when he joined with Taft in a "Stop-Dewey" movement during the 1948 convention.[9] Moreover, he entered the 1952 race with no hope of support from the politicians of his adopted state. It has been suggested that one reason for Stassen's acceptance of the presidency of the University of Pennsylvania was his desire to gain a majority of the large Keystone delegation in 1952 or 1956. Whatever may have been his ambitions in this respect, he lost any possibility of aid from Pennsylvania Republicans as a result of the state campaign of 1950. After the 1950 elections, Senator Duff and Governor Fine emerged as leaders of the two major Republican factions, and Stassen found himself in the unenviable position of having opposed both men.[10] Ineffective organization was further revealed by a constant shortage of funds in the Stassen camp. By April, only three of the Stassen offices could be maintained, and by June, only one could be supported.[11] Under these circumstances the former Governor had but one alternative. He had to gain popular support by his speaking in primary elections if he hoped to achieve his ambition.

In taking his case to the people, Stassen was handicapped by the belief that his candidacy was related to the Eisenhower drive. As early as July, 1951, he was reported to have suggested, in a conference with Dewey, that "he enter his own name in crucial primaries with the public promise to switch his dele-

[6] The vote was: Stassen 128,605; Eisenhower, 106,946; Taft, 24,019.

[7] LIX (April 14, 1952), 24.

[8] *New York Times*, April 25, 1952, p. 13. Mr. Reston further reported that Stassen ". . . does not, in any event, think that his Presidential fortunes ever could be revived after the setbacks of the last four years."

[9] *Ibid.*, December 30, 1951, Sec. 4, p. 2.

[10] In 1950, Stassen backed Cooke and Kunkel, as opposed to Fine and Duff, in their bids for nomination as Governor and United States Senator, respectively. In so doing he aligned himself with the faction of the party regarded generally as the "conservative wing," dominated by Grundy and Owlett. The Duff-Fine ticket was victorious. After the election, Governor Fine joined the Grundy forces, leaving Stassen in the position of having actively opposed the leaders of both state factions—Duff and Fine. For a clear account of current Republican political affairs in Pennsylvania, see: *Time*, LIX (June 30, 1952), 18-21.

[11] *Philadelphia Inquirer*, April 13, 1952, p. 2; *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, June 21, 1952, p. 2.

gates to Ike."[12] In November, Stassen made his well-known offer to Taft that both withdraw in favor of Eisenhower, and his visit to the General's headquarters in Paris immediately preceded the announcement of his own candidacy on December 27, 1951. The coupling of the Paris visit and the announcement could serve only to emphasize the intense interest in the General's plans and to detract from his own programs. *Time* noted that "reporters could hardly wait for Stassen to stop talking about his own candidacy" so eager were they to hear of his conversations with the General.[13] Stassen refused to reveal what was said at SHAPE, but he did affirm that the talks there had a "direct bearing" on his decision to run. Since this statement could be interpreted two ways,[14] it failed to allay suspicions, despite repeated denials, that Stassen was serving as a "stalking horse" for a "Stop-Taft" drive, pending Eisenhower's return.[15]

As the campaign progressed, Stassen's relationship to the Eisenhower movement became more confused. His entrance into the New Hampshire and New Jersey primaries against both Taft and Eisenhower seemed to indicate that he was carrying on an independent campaign.[16] On the other hand, he offered publicly to give the General one-half of any delegates he might win in Wisconsin,[17] and similar offers were made in his campaigns in Ohio, Nebraska, and Illinois.[18] At Cleveland, while maintaining he was a "sincere candidate," he declared that "On the broad issues I am on the same side as General Eisenhower," and he spent most of his speech defending the General.[19] Stassen's actions may have been dictated by his desire to halt Taft's drive, or to help Eisenhower win, or to gain a cabinet post for himself should the General become President.[20] But whatever his motives, his seemingly contradictory statements relative to Eisenhower could serve only to detract attention from the policies he advocated as being vitally needed by the party and nation.

Since Stassen's main hope of securing the nomination rested upon his ability to win voters by his speaking, a study of those speeches may reveal a basic cause of his failures in 1952. What, then, shall we conclude about his speech-making? Certainly it cannot be criticized as lacking in quantity. Although he failed to keep pace with Taft and although he did not nearly equal his extensive tours of 1948,[21] he campaigned actively in New Hampshire, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, Washington, and Oregon.

[12] *Time*, LVIII (July 30, 1951), 12. The article further declared that Stassen had held a meeting with his advisers in which this plan was agreed upon.

[13] LIX (January 7, 1952), 12.

[14] Senator Lodge, a leading supporter of Eisenhower, felt called upon to announce, after a trans-Atlantic telephone call to the General, that Stassen's candidacy did not mean that Eisenhower would not be available. See the *New York Times*, December 28, 1951, p. 1.

[15] At the beginning of his candidacy, Stassen was forced to deny, time after time, that he had arranged a "deal" with the General. This was the case during his interview in Washington (*Ibid.*), at a press conference the following day (*Ibid.*, December 29, 1951, p. 5) and during his appearance on "Meet the Press," a national television program (*Ibid.*, January 7, 1952, p. 1.)

[16] In regard to New Jersey, however, it was reported that Stassen was considering withdrawing so that he would not take votes from Eisenhower. (*New York Times*, April 6, 1952.)

[17] Speech at Sheboygan, March 25, 1952. (*New York Times*, March 26, 1952.) The Stassen men went so far as to run full-page advertisements in Wisconsin papers seeking votes for the "Stassen-Eisenhower Ticket." (*Ibid.*, March 28, 1952.)

[18] *Ibid.*, March 27, April 3, April 6, April 20, April 23, April 26, May 8, 1952.

[19] *Ibid.*, April 27, 1952, Sec. 1, p. 61. Leaders of the Eisenhower forces in Ohio, however, disassociated themselves from the Stassen campaign. (*Ibid.*, May 8, 1952.)

[20] This possible motive, however, Stassen specifically denied. Interview with James Reston, *New York Times*, April 25, 1952, p. 13.

[21] See: Frederick G. Alexander, "Harold E. Stassen," *QJS*, XXXIV (October 1948), 314.

His tours included speeches to Chambers of Commerce, women's groups, luncheon clubs, business organizations, labor unions, student conventions, planned political rallies, political conventions, as well as informal talks with small groups of citizens along his route of travel. Frequently he appeared on radio and television programs, local and national.

Nor can it be said that his speeches suffered from poor delivery or composition. Handsome and strapping in appearance, he delivered his speeches with his usual graceful gestures, melodious voice, and engaging smile. Only in a newly devised television format, wherein two actors, posing as a typical young couple, addressed questions to him, did his delivery seem stilted and unnatural. The questions thus addressed to him were obviously "planted," and his "calculated pose" in trying to play the role of an informal visitor in a home seemed unreal and artificial to the viewers.[22] Moreover, his addresses were well organized. The speech announcing his candidacy revealed his training as a debater when he declared of his program, "it is sound, it is desirable, it is urgently needed . . . ," and then proceeded to organize his thoughts in accordance with these traditional divisions.[23] His major foreign policy address followed the accepted "problem-solution" pattern.[24]

The major weakness of the Stassen speeches is to be found in the positions he assumed and the arguments he advanced. The former Governor failed to re-establish himself as a symbol of liberalism within the Republican party. In previous years in this role he had been the outspoken critic of "Old Guard" domestic and "isolationist" foreign policies. As Mr. Reston phrased it:

> Mr. Stassen used to be a symbol of liberal Republican youth. . . . There was no question then that he would not answer, no man in the field he would not challenge. He was a favorite of the reporters. He was the darling of the League of Women Voters, a rallying point for the politically homeless, who saw in him that legendary American political amateur: the man who was determined to prove that good morals could be good politics.[25]

By 1952, Stassen's popular support and his reputation as a liberal had declined. A Gallup Poll in November, 1951, revealed that only 4 per cent of all voters desired him as their President.[26] Early in 1952, only 5 per cent of Republican and only 9 per cent of independent voters endorsed him.[27] Opinions varied as to the causes of his loss of public support, but there seemed no doubt of the fact. Perhaps the 1948 debate with Dewey, when Stassen advocated the outlawing of the Communist Party, marked the beginning of the decline. Perhaps his alliance with Taft in the 1948 convention explains his decline in popularity, or his apparent support for Senator McCarthy in the latter's assault upon the State Department. His frequent, sometimes sensational, pronouncements during 1948-51 on various national issues, such as socialized medicine, may have been a cause.[28] Whatever the causes, with Senator Taft in the field

[22] See: Jack Gould, "The X of the Campaign —TV 'Personality'," *New York Times*, June 22, 1952, Sec. 6, p. 41.

[23] Delivered at the Warwick Hotel in Philadelphia, December 27, 1951. The full text is given in the *New York Times*, December 28, 1951, p. 6.

[24] Delivered before the Republican Club of the District of Columbia, February 28, 1952. The full text is given in *Vital Speeches*, XVIII (March 15, 1952), 327-330.

[25] *New York Times*, December 28, 1951, p. 7.

[26] *Time*, LVIII (November 12, 1951), 23.

[27] *Ibid.*, LIX (February 18, 1952), 19.

[28] These causes are all suggested by Mr. Reston, *New York Times*, December 28, 1951, p. 7. Stassen's support of the Republican organization in Philadelphia in 1951, when thousands of Republican voters refused to endorse it again and turned it out of office, may have contributed to his decline as a symbol of liberalism.

as an able champion of conservative views, Stassen's main hope of gaining wide support in 1952 depended upon his ability to re-establish his reputation as the spokesman for liberalism in his party.

In regard to foreign policy, Stassen seems to have understood the logic of his situation, for he campaigned vigorously for "internationalist" policies. He rejected both the "containment" policy of Truman and the "isolationist" policy of Taft. He proposed a "positive, forward-looking" program which would "win a victory for the cause of freedom and civilization, over communist imperialism, without a war." Specifically, he proposed re-organization of the Voice of America; open advocacy and support of independence for the Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Armenia, and Ruthenia, as well as the satellite nations; economic sanctions against Russia and her allies; amelioration of the colonial policies of our allies; advocacy of democracy for Argentina, Spain, and Yugoslavia; an adequate defense force with emphasis upon air power; and re-organization of the United Nations.[29] These views certainly established Stassen as a "liberal internationalist." A liberal voter could look askance only at his declaration, made in the speech announcing his candidacy and not stressed subsequently, that he would withhold American aid from nations that persisted in nationalizing their industries,[30] and his promise that, if elected, he would restore MacArthur to command in the Pacific.[31]

On foreign policy, thus, Stassen took a consistent, defensible, internationalist position. He offered a real alternative to Taft's views, and he differed sufficiently from Truman's program to avoid the charges of "me-too-ism." Why then did not these views gain for him wide support? Probably because the more popular Eisenhower was regarded as the "international" candidate who could accomplish all and more than Stassen advocated.

In regard to domestic issues Stassen more clearly failed to recapture the symbol of liberalism for himself. Here many of the programs he advocated seemed both conservative and inadequate. Moreover, he sometimes failed to show by what means he would accomplish the laudable objectives he espoused. In his announcement speech he contended for (1) honesty in government, (2) adoption of a "modern" gold standard, (3) reduction of the Federal payroll and government spending, (4) voluntary profit-sharing programs to lessen labor-management tensions, (5) equitable taxation, and (6) a fair distribution of national income for labor, business, and agriculture. Just what a "modern" gold standard meant went unexplained as did its relation to the problem of inflation where credit seems more important than currency. Profit-sharing as the solution to industrial strife seemed too pat. If his proposed fifty per cent limit on income taxes left the budget unbalanced, why, then, "other means" of raising money are to be found. The method whereby farmers were to receive their deserved share of national income was not discussed. Stassen's conservative bent in regard to domestic problems was further revealed when he named MacArthur, Baruch, Eisenhower, Hoover, Bunche, Farley, and Byrd as the men on whom he would depend for advice were he elected. By this program he could not hope to regain leadership of the liberal wing of his party. As Ed-

[29] Speech before the Republican Club of the District of Columbia, *loc. cit.*

[30] *Loc. cit.*

[31] Speech at Elizabeth, New Jersey. *New York Times*, April 10, 1952, p. 12.

ward R. Murrow put it, Stassen's announcement and his program hit the nation with all the "impact of a feather dropped from low altitude."[32] The *New York Times* pointed to the "empty phrases" and "lack of demonstration" which characterized this speech, and concluded: "A good part of this platform could be endorsed by almost anybody . . ."[33]

As the campaign progressed, Stassen seemed to sense that he would have to return to his progressive views of 1948 if he were to win more support. He soon announced his support for a Federal compulsory FEPC law.[34] During the Wisconsin primary he refused to commit himself in regard to Senator McCarthy,[35] but later, in Illinois, he deplored the Senator's "wild-swinging recklessness."[36] During the Ohio primary, Stassen declared for amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act along lines proposed by Senator Ives,[37] and by the end of the campaign he was advocating "a completely new law, more friendly to labor," to replace it.[38] These views, espoused from the beginning of his campaign, might have enabled him to continue as a recognized leader of liberal Republicanism. One feels that he returned to them too late and that he lost support as a result.

Convention time found the former Governor advocating his foreign and domestic programs before the Resolutions Committee in Chicago.[39] It also found him "disappointed" because Eisenhower had proved "too conservative" on civil rights, labor legislation, and taxes.[40] He was of the opinion that the convention would find Taft and Eisenhower deadlocked, and he advised, "Don't count me out." A deadlock might have had that result, but it is difficult to disagree with *Time's* response to his statement:

> At that, the political surveyors got out their levels, carefully reckoned Stassen's position, and decided he should be counted exactly as before: out.[41]

Robert A. Taft

In a world in which records are set only to be broken, Robert Taft of Ohio may be unique. Not only has he been one of the most frequent seekers for the GOP presidential nomination; the sustained fight he made for it in 1951-52 sets a record that seems unlikely ever to be equalled.

Between April of 1951 and July 7 of 1952 the indefatigable Mr. Taft delivered more than 600 full-length speeches, stumped in forty-three states, appeared on innumerable radio and television programs (incidentally, and sometimes obviously, much to his distaste), held 187 press conferences, and conferred almost daily with his campaign strategists and far-flung organization. In addition, the senator made a practice of meeting head-on every challenge or question on the major issues every time he encountered them. It was a campaign effort without precedent in American political history. And it failed.

Although the causes of that failure may never be determined, it seemed almost foreordained. Writing in *QJS* in

[32] Television program, "See It Now," December 30, 1951. Quoted by the writer from memory.

[33] Editorial, December 28, 1951, p. 20. Harold L. Ickes, with his usual tart tongue, remarked that the nation had little to fear so long as Stassen ". . . has both the will and wit to pledge . . . firm financial policies in Washington." *New Republic*, CXXVI (January 14, 1952), 18.

[34] On "Meet the Press," telecast January 6, 1952. *New York Times*, January 7, 1952, p. 8.

[35] *New York Times*, March 28, 1952, p. 16.

[36] *Ibid.*, April 8, 1952, p. 3.

[37] *Ibid.*, April 24, 1952, p. 13.

[38] *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, June 21, 1952, p. 2.

[39] *New York Times*, July 2, 1952, p. 19 and 20.

[40] *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, June 21, 1952, p. 2.

[41] LIX (June 30, 1952), 17.

1948, Lionel Crocker compared Taft to Stassen:

> When pitted against the politically attractive Harold E. Stassen, Robert A. Taft found himself speaking to dozens while Stassen spoke to thousands. . . . [Yet] strangely enough the logical proof of Taft was sufficient to stop the onrush of Stassen's runaway campaign. . . .

But note Dr. Crocker's concluding paragraph,

> Had [Stassen] followed the advice of Taft [and stayed out of the Ohio campaign] . . . might not the Republicans opposed to Thomas E. Dewey have united to give *Stassen* the nomination?

Mr. Crocker seems to have given no serious credence to the possibility that Taft's own campaign might have won the national prize. Taft in 1948 was almost as anxious to be the Republican candidate as in 1952. Confronted with glamor in his own state, he won. Confronted by a smoothly working Dewey machine at the national convention, he went down to an overwhelming defeat. In 1952 he was to meet an Eisenhower backed by a Dewey, and by the time a tired Everett Dirksen placed his name in nomination in Chicago the issue was decided—Senator Taft's epochal crusade was to end in failure.

Our problem here is not to attempt to assign cause for that failure, but to examine the speaking of the Ohio Senator during the weary months preceding Chicago. Because of its volume and variety, only broad generalizations are possible. Let us consider the kinds of communication in which he was engaged.

First, although Senator Taft made more speeches than any other man in history while actively seeking the Republican nomination, those speeches were remarkably similar in content and in structure. Even their oral style hardly varied, although the delivery was almost always extemporaneous. It was your critic's privilege to hear Mr. Taft on literally dozens of occasions; though the audience and the occasion changed, the basic pattern of the speech was common. The Truman Fair Deal had been in power too long and had grown corrupt in power. In domestic affairs it was leading America to socialism; in foreign relations, under the influence of the Acheson-Hiss clique in the State Department, it had been soft to communism and had climaxed its pyramid of errors by engaging in the "Truman [Korean] war," which it was now afraid to win.

The Taft speech, when given to a friendly audience, usually won an enthusiastic response. Extraordinary in Taft's campaign was almost fanatical support from those who heard him most frequently. Neutrals and opponents were not visibly moved, however. From audiences like Cleveland's world-famed City Club came sustained applause—but searching and hostile questions, especially on foreign policy. Audiences largely hostile seldom heard the Senator deliver a formal speech during the campaign months of 1952.

In content, the Senator's speeches were always well organized. He knew his beliefs thoroughly, and had a rationale for each which was logically valid, if his basic premises were accepted. His style, although often almost too plain, did hold attention. His delivery was marred by a flat, harsh voice and by choppy, repetitious gesture, but possessed a strength and sincerity of considerable impact.

Second, Senator Taft's other speaking situations—radio and television forums, press conferences and the like—found him presenting much the same material. During the early months of his pre-convention campaign (September, 1951, to

March, 1952), these occasions were relatively infrequent, and were characterized by a friendly, though somewhat acid, response to disagreement or to hostile question. During the later months, an apparently growing irritation with those who disagreed was manifest. Some of the last discussions—most notably "Author Meets the Critics"—were marked by extreme acrimony on both sides.

It was in these informal talks or press conferences that the Senator was most handicapped by the same bluntness and forcefulness which characterized his formal speaking. The frequent answer, "That's simply not true" seemed to fix opposition, and, it must be noted in fairness, support. General independent or neutral reaction, as indicated in letters to the editor and in similar ways, seemed largely negative, however.

Third, the Senator's book, *A Foreign Policy for Americans*, became a part of his total pattern of communication. Given a varied reception by reviewers and readers, it rounded out the positions Senator Taft was prepared to defend. Since it is readily available, a review of its contents is not necessary here. Suffice it to say, the book was consistent with those other beliefs presented by Mr. Taft.

In none of these media of communication did Taft succeed in winning a ground swell of popular support. Rather his advocates grew steadily more intense in their support; his opponents more and more bitter in their opposition. Public opinion poll after poll indicated no significant shift in the numbers on either side, and thus the argument that "Taft can't win" became an almost compelling one.

When one surveys the scope and the intensity of the Taft campaign effort, and when one recalls Aristotle's statement that "truth and justice are more powerful than their opposites; so that, when decisions are not made as they should be, the speakers with the right on their side have only themselves to thank for the outcome," the Taft campaign effort presents a curious dilemma. Either "truth and justice" were not with the Taft cause, or the Aristotelian thesis is not entirely valid. It may well be that each should undergo critical reexamination.

Earl Warren

Governor Earl Warren of California will find no place in future anthologies of "great eloquence." And yet, although failing to capture the Republican presidential nomination, he is of greater significance to rhetorical critics than the facile label of "also-ran" might suggest.

Warren's Problem

Without the international experience and glamor of Eisenhower, Warren had only a slim chance from the start. In contrast to the much more vigorous and extensive effort in 1948, which culminated in his nomination for the Vice-Presidency, Warren conducted in 1952 what he himself frankly called a "limited campaign."[42] There was no national "Warren-for-President" organization, no huge fund, no whoop-la.[43] He thus went into the convention with an irreducible minimum of only 76 votes. And he ended in third place—exactly what he expected, as he had publicly announced on June 27.[44] What, then, was Warren's real goal? And by what means—rhetorical or otherwise—did he expect to reach it?

Warren's problem may be summarized

[42] In his speech to the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., June 27, reported in *Los Angeles Times*, June 28, 1952.
[43] *Ibid.*
[44] *Ibid.*

as follows: (1) The only realistic strategy was to hope for—but not necessarily to engineer—a deadlock.[45] (2) In order to capitalize upon a deadlock, if it developed, Warren had to wield a bloc of convention votes large enough to command respect. (3) California, with its 70 votes, offered such a bloc. (4) Warren is used to winning elections in California; in spite of an overwhelming majority of Democratic registrations, he is the only governor ever elected three times in the history of the state. Hence, a primary victory in California could be regarded as a fairly safe probability. (5) It would help, it is true, to have more of a national following. The campaigns—modest as they were—in Wisconsin and Oregon undoubtedly were designed to overcome any impression that Warren was purely a local phenomenon. However, the electorate had come to know him as Dewey's running mate in 1948; and, more important, most of the convention delegates—the ones who cast the ballots—knew Earl Warren pretty well.[46] The crucial task was to win the California primary election of June 3.

The rhetorical significance of this line of reasoning is that Warren had no need to conduct an intensive public speaking campaign. He did not face the problems of Taft and Eisenhower. Although he had to contend with the most formidable opposition ever mobilized against him in California,[47] he achieved a two-to-one majority.[48] And so, without having to do a great deal of public speaking, Warren gained his immediate objective: he entered the convention with enough strength to capitalize on any deadlock that might develop. He had a good chance of holding in his hands the balance of power.[49]

[45] Early in April Kyle Palmer *(Los Angeles Times,* April 6) reported that "political wiseacres . . . now rate him the likeliest compromise choice in the event of a no-decision ending to the scrimmage between the Senator and the General." See also his column in the *Times* for June 22. The "Newsgram" of *U. S. News and World Report,* XXXII (April 18, 1952) predicted that a Taft-Eisenhower deadlock was a "definite possibility." Warren, in that event, "could be a natural except that the conservatives oppose him." In the same magazine (June 27, p. 36) Warren was described as occupying "a strategic position," since "release of the [California] delegation . . . could be the decisive break of the Convention." The balance of power in the convention was held by "favorite-son candidates, such as Governor Warren," declared W. H. Lawrence *(New York Times,* July 12), pointing out that "Governor Warren's California delegation held firm in the hope of a deadlock. . . ." The "Periscope" of *Newsweek,* XL (July 21, 1952), 15, offered the following interpretation: "Behind California's stubborn refusal to switch to Eisenhower was Warren's conviction that a deadlock was in the cards and that the convention would have to turn to him in the end." And see Warren's own frank admission that a deadlock was his only chance, in his speech to the National Press Club, Washington, June 27.

[46] Gordon Harrison, "Warren of California," *Harper's Magazine,* CCIV (June 1952), 27-32. Harrison emphasizes that one of Warren's weaknesses is his comparatively regional appeal. However, an officer of the Republican National Committee from an Eastern state in personal interview assured the writer that among the delegates Warren was very well—and favorably—known.

[47] His opposition rallied around Representative Thomas H. Werdel, whose candidacy was purely nominal and for whom a vote was essentially in favor of an uninstructed delegation. Werdel was commonly understood to be definitely conservative in his views and a supporter of Taft. See Earl C. Behrens, "Look Reports," *Look,* XVI (April 8, 1952), 109. In an outburst of anger and vitriol, rare for Governor Warren, he called his opposition a "coalition of hate" *(Los Angeles Times,* May 22) dealing in "smears" rather than a constructive, sincere counter-program *(Los Angeles Times,* May 4). Wrote Kyle Palmer *(Los Angeles Times,* June 8, 1952): ". . . Gov. Warren continues to be the political stud-duck in California. His political enemies ganged up on him to an extent seldom experienced here, and managed to spend a prodigious amount of money in trying to defeat him. . . . when viewed in the light of California's traditional tendency to turn against its Governors after just one term (Warren has won three!) the Governor's showing was magnificent."

[48] *Newsweek,* XXXIX (June 16, 1952), 27. The Los Angeles *Daily News,* in an editorial, June 12, declared: ". . . the people of California still believe in Earl Warren. Every county in the state except Orange county gave him a majority."

[49] *U. S. News & World Report,* XXXII (June 27, 1952), 36 (see *supra,* footnote 45). One commentator, during the convention, went so

Warren's Speaking

Competent critics have already discussed various aspects of Warren's public addresses.[50] Attention here will be directed only to a few dominant characteristics which seem to set Earl Warren somewhat apart from the great majority of political speakers today. This review suggests that Governor Warren might have been able to offer the unique "rhetorical medicine" needed by the G. O. P. in 1952. Four reasons will be adduced in support of this hypothesis.

Warren's chief sources of effectiveness appear to reside in *inventio*, rather than in *elocutio* (style) or *pronuntiatio* (delivery). His use of language and of voice are undistinguished. His language is not vivid, and frequently his voice—rather lacking in resonance to start with—is jerky and monotonous.[51] His bodily delivery, especially his robust personal appearance, is much more impressive than the vocal. Many people regard him as handsome; he has a ready smile; and he usually appears alert and animated. He looks better than he sounds, but he is seldom, if ever, an impassioned speaker.[52] In some respects he thus appears not to possess the rhetorical medicine required by the Republicans this year.

As Aristotle long ago pointed out, however, the impact of a speaker's personality upon an audience *(ethos)* may be the most important element in total effectiveness. All four characteristics of Warren's speaking singled out here clearly contribute to his ethical proof, and there seems no reason for revising Chapin's judgment of four years ago that Warren's "greatest appeal is the ethical."[53]

1. *Ability to win friends.* If winning friends influences people, then Earl Warren should be influential. "Wherever he goes and wherever he takes his charming family he makes friends . . . [and] endears himself to the voters by a warm grin and a handshake, backed up by an air and a record of absolute integrity."[54] When the editors of *U. S. News and World Report* asked him why he wanted to be president, he replied, "I really like to serve the public. . . . I like people and . . . I like their problems."[55] Warren usually impresses his audiences as being friendly, genial, and unaffected.[56] Some listeners have felt

far as to assert that: ". . . the only obstacle which the general faced was the rather determined effort of the friends of Governor Warren to hold apart from the Eisenhower bandwagon, believing that, if after a ballot or two the general didn't gain a majority, his strength would crumble and California might name a native son as the winner." (David Lawrence, *loc. cit.*) Before the start of the convention it was commonly believed that Warren would throw his support to Eisenhower. *U. S. News & World Report*, XXXII (June 27, 1952), 36, conjectured that, "If given his own wish, the Governor would probably turn it to 'Ike.' . . . When the pinch comes in Convention, the Governor is counted as a friend by the Eisenhower forces." Dana C. Smith, general chairman of the Eisenhower groups in Southern California, announced (*Los Angeles Times*, May 22) that his organization "unanimously recommends to its member groups and all Republican voters who favor Gen. Eisenhower . . ." that they mark their ballots for Warren. And the Eisenhower people rejoiced that Warren won the primary (see *Los Angeles Times*, June 5). See also Lawrence E. Davies, *New York Times*, July 4; Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 27; and editorial in the *Los Angeles Times*, May 11.

[50] Besides Harrison, *op. cit.*, see: Leland Chapin, "Earl Warren," *QJS*, XXXIV (October 1948), 308-310; John P. Hoshor, "Some Comments on the Speaking of Governor Earl Warren in the 1948 Campaign," *Western Speech*, XV (January 1951), 13-16.

[51] This was especially obvious to the writer in the Governor's victory statement, by radio, the night of the June 3 California primary. See also Chapin, *op. cit.*, p. 309.

[52] Harrison (*op. cit.*, p. 28) refers to Warren's "personality without emotional fire" and to his lack of a "dynamic public presence," combined with the fact that the Governor is "committed to a program that is sound rather than flashy." For similar judgments, see Chapin, *loc. cit.*, and editorial in Los Angeles *Daily News*, June 12, 1952.

[53] Chapin, *op. cit.*, p. 310.

[54] Harrison, *loc. cit.*

[55] "Interview with Governor Warren of California," May 2, 1952, p. 47.

[56] Chapin (*op. cit.*, p. 309) cites Kaltenborn's impression of Warren's delivery as "warm, simple, and sincere." See also Harrison, *loc. cit.*

> We can't complain about getting into the Korean situation. We might complain about the way it was done, but I don't believe that we can complain about the ultimate fact that we are trying to prevent Communist aggression. . . .
>
> There is a world political question there, as well as a military question. There is a question of our relationship not only with China and Russia but also with the other countries of Asia, and even with our friends in Europe. . . . It's an involved situation and I would be hesitant in condemning anyone for not doing what might have started a third World War.[69]

And on the issue of General MacArthur's dismissal, the Governor neatly refused to swallow the bait: "The President had the right to do so. Whether he acted wisely is for history to determine. As someone has said, no matter how thin you make a pancake, there are two sides to it."[70]

Conclusions

Why did the Republicans reject Earl Warren? The following are doubtless important reasons: (1) The delegates, hesitant to renominate a loser, recalled that Warren shared the losing ticket of 1948. (2) A significant number of Republicans fear that Warren is not a strict enough "party man," that he is "too liberal." (3) The California Governor is not an exciting, dynamic, emotional speaker. (4) Warren could not match the national prestige or public careers of either Taft or Eisenhower.

The purpose here is not to suggest that Warren would have been a wiser choice than Eisenhower. It is merely argued that, in many respects, Warren offered the kind of rhetoric needed by the Republicans in 1952. It is interesting to note the opinion of a Republican Senator who felt, along "before the convention began that . . . Warren, if nominated, would prove the strongest of all the Republican candidates, winning many Democratic party votes."[71] This opinion was voiced not by a California retainer of the Warren machine, but by George D. Aiken of Vermont. Such a view may be extravagant. But there is much to recommend the editorial position of a Democratic newspaper that Warren's nomination "would compel the Democrats to nominate the most electable man they can induce to take the post."[72]

III. THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

"You Will Be On Television! 140,000,000 Eyes Will Watch You! Remember—You may not know it—television may be showing a closeup picture of you!" This admonition to mind his manners, printed on a small yellow card, and found in his chair by each delegate and guest at the 31st National Democratic Convention, dramatized the impact of electronics on American political life. That life was simpler at Baltimore in 1832, at the first Democratic convention, when a little group of officeholders held an intimate forum to renominate Jackson. At Chicago in 1952 Adlai Stevenson was nominated by a convention that was as close to each citizen in the nation as his television screen. And the most significant fact about that convention, studied as a problem in communication, was the extent to which it assumed many aspects of a dramatic production, *of* the delegates, *by* the delegates, but *for* the radio and television audience.

All during the Republican convention Democratic scouts monitoring the television networks noted production errors and developed their own video-strat-

[69] Interview in *U. S. News & World Report*, *loc. cit.*, p. 41.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

[71] Reported in the Burlington, Vermont, *Free Press*, July 12, 1952.

[72] Los Angeles *Daily News*, June 12, 1952.

egy: profile views of speakers would be supplanted by full front pictures to avoid distracting backgrounds; the speaker's platform would be kept clear of competing personalities; huge posters and pictures would be hung so strategically around the hall that panoramic shots would inevitably pick them up; the stage would be set at committee hearings in anticipation of television. Finally, in advance letters to all delegates, alternates, and officials, and in the delegate guide book, Kenneth Fry, radio-television director, prompted his actors for their roles:

> How you look, what you do, what you say, is of the utmost importance to our victory in November . . . attend every session—on time. Nothing looks worse on television than empty seats . . . maintain a dignified manner at all times . . . men should never wear white shirts . . . women should avoid sleeveless dresses . . . point your chin at the cameras. This will hold your head up in the right position . . . Remember that TV exaggerates expressions . . . Don't show the cameras smiles that are too broad or frowns that are too severe. Avoid wide gestures . . . Remember that when you are talking on television you are talking to a small group of people in their own homes. Talk naturally, as if you were in the room with them . . . This is most important! Once the nominees have been selected, do not wear buttons of other candidates.

Watching the Republicans paid off: technically, the Democrats produced a better show. Indeed, television may have improved upon the real thing: radio and television audiences often knew more about what was happening on the convention floor than did the delegates themselves. After Congressman Dawson's civil rights appeal, for example, only the television audience went down on the floor to hear the acid rebuttal of Governor Talmadge, delivered into a network "walkie-talkie." Closeups of Governor Byrnes and Senator Byrd during the "loyalty pledge" fight were more revealing than many speeches. And only with electronics could one dash across town to interview Senator Kefauver at his hotel while the convention was in session.

While the magic of television itself loomed largest to stay-at-homes, the convention hall observer could sort out other impressions:

Ladies Day

No major speech at the Republican convention was delivered by a woman. As if to underscore that omission the Democrats turned their platform over to the ladies for a whole day. Not all of the fair sex were as fair or as pleasant to hear as Mrs. Dorothy Vredenburgh, who read the convention call, and most of them unfortunately felt compelled to point out at length what their very presence proved: women, too, are important in politics. There were two happy exceptions. One was the attractive Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, Ambassador to Denmark, almost the only speaker at the convention who mastered the art of a quiet and conversational delivery, and one of the few who told a simple story simply. She reviewed the accomplishments of American policy in Europe with an earnestness that came from deep personal involvement in her subject, and the result was moving. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, hailed as "the first lady of the world," won a rare genuine ovation on her own merits. Telling the story of the United Nations as a bipartisan narrative, bare of stylistic flourishes, and concluding with the words her husband intended to deliver at the 1945 Jefferson Day dinner, Mrs. Roosevelt made the UN come alive. Refuting the familiar canard, all the ladies spoke briefly; in a press conference Perle Mesta observed that no convention speech should be more than fifteen minutes. Applause.

The Great Debate

With the possible exception of the Republicans, only Betty Furness, for Westinghouse, outdid the Democrats in the public washing of dirty linen. But the great debate on the "loyalty pledge," highlighting the antithetical elements in the party, produced some of the most effective public speaking of the convention. This issue led men to rise above the idle oratory of convention ceremony; they fought for principles about which they felt deeply, and their feelings called forth dynamic, hardhitting, and effective speaking. In the committee rooms Maverick, Daniels, and Franklin Roosevelt were the most persuasive. On the floor Moody and Freeman, the young men of the North, were clear and forceful. No man was ever more appropriately named than Governor Battle; his grim challenge to the northerners was a high point in the floor fight, and he was ably seconded by the rugged Governor Kennon and the old-school orator, Cameron Morrison. In sheer impromptu eloquence the peak in this debate was reached by Russell Long, defying his state organization to announce his personal adherence to the pledge. His impassioned declaration may have changed no votes, but even the press gallery cynics were impressed by his sincerity and fervor.

Mr. Speaker

The chairman's lot is not happy: there were moments when Sam Rayburn was both tested and testy. The House of Representatives is seldom as unruly as were the delegates when Rayburn found it expedient to exhibit that selective deafness which is an occupational malady for many chairmen. On the other hand, Rayburn was a fast man with a gavel, and seemed to rely upon an acoustical sixth sense in estimating the greater volume on apparently equal voice votes. It was a difficult job at best: half-vote delegates shouted as loudly as those with full votes, and the gallery spectators often cast their votes, too. On the whole, the Democrats were pretty democratic.

The Ceremonial Orators

Through long tradition political conventions must listen to a battery of even longer ritualistic speeches: McKinney, Dever, and Rayburn held the rostrum for nearly three hours, but they held their audiences for far less. In nearly fifty minutes of uninspired oratory, for example, Sam Rayburn was interrupted by applause but nine times, heaviest on the platitudinous line, "The American people in 1952 are not going to trade prosperity for promises." To a seemingly endless series of rhetorical questions—"Is the Sheriff standing outside your door to take your home away from you?"—the delegates made no response, and Rayburn abruptly omitted large sections from his prepared speech. Keynoter Dever, after a full dress rehearsal for the newsreel photographers the day before, received slightly more attention, but the applause was loudest from his own Massachusetts delegation. During this speech the Hawaiian delegates chatted with the Louisiana and Kentucky alternates, the Mississippi delegation held an almost continuous conference, and the delegates from New Mexico, Texas, Georgia, Wyoming, New Hampshire, and Missouri roamed the aisles and greeted friends in the box seats, while the South Dakota delegation almost pointedly ignored the speaker. To the credit of the Hawaiians, when the speech which they hadn't heard was concluded, they jumped upon their chairs and cheered it for nearly six minutes.

This indifferent audience behavior is difficult to appreciate without being witnessed; even television failed to re-

cord the full extent of the convention confusion. A deliberate effort to distract the delegates could hardly have been more successful than the huge pictures of Democratic heroes, the billboard size slogans, the colorful bunting, the omnipresent flashbulb, the newsreel and television cameras on their balcony catwalks and mid-floor superstructures, the holiday spirit in the galleries, the milling of dignitaries on the platform, the ever-surging aisles, the continuous buzzing of delegate conversation, and the background roar of the air-conditioning equipment.

With such competition even good speeches would be handicapped; long-winded speeches, filled with generalities, and bombastically shouted into a microphone, had no chance. When it became apparent that each of the three ceremonial orators was still campaigning against Herbert Hoover, and with the same worn clichés, all was lost.

The Nominators

Like the ceremonial orators, those who declaimed the virtues of "the man who . . ." also followed an ancient ritual, mercifully held to twenty minutes each, with five minutes for each of two seconders. In the thirteen hour and twenty-five minute nominating session these speeches offered the only dramatic relief from the mad, howling demonstrations. Those which offered the greatest relief were undoubtedly Browning's nomination of Kefauver, Freeman's speech for Humphrey, Franklin Roosevelt's nomination of Harriman, and McCormack's seconding speech for Barkley. One is led to recall with approval the twenty-odd words used to place Abraham Lincoln in nomination in 1860.

The Party Line

Three speakers at the convention were outstanding in their persuasive development of the party theses: Douglas, Barkley, and Truman. "I shall speak about the Korean War," began Douglas with professorial abruptness, and the delegates settled back expecting a dull lecture from the man with the large loose-leaf notebook. In that it was rigorously organized, with the outline showing through at all times, and with two pages of footnotes in the advance press copy, it was a lecture, but dull it never was. Having delivered sixty speeches in the preceding nine days, Douglas was in poor voice for this effort, but he made up for that lack with abundant energy and vigorous gestures as he delivered a bare-fisted attack upon the "Republican history" of the Korean War and a defense of the administration. This key issue will not be met during the coming campaign with greater vigor or keener analysis.

"What I shall say . . . shall be spoken from the heart and not from a piece of paper." No matter what its source, Alben Barkley's speech was a great oratorical effort, properly acclaimed in a great demonstration. It was a remarkable instance of a fighting partisan speech that somehow seemed gentle and honest, of a speech filled with generalities that somehow seemed concrete, of a valedictory that somehow seemed like a new beginning. Barkley's delivery was more oratorical than conversational, yet the audience, more attentive than for any previous speaker, had a feeling of great personal warmth and intimate communication, and the applause was frequent, spirited, and genuine. One of the misfortunes of this convention was that Alben Barkley, an announced candidate for the nomination, could not be invited to be its keynoter.

The third major speech delineating the 1952 party line was by the old "whistle-stopper" of 1948. Although Truman's announced purpose was to introduce the

the Korean battlefields seemed directly designed to elicit sympathy.[76]

But the speech served a campaign purpose, intentionally or not. It dramatically reestablished Alben Barkley as the symbol of that nebulous Democratic solidarity. Again he had passed up a chance for personal vindictiveness for constructive party support. Again he had demonstrated his good sense, his restraint, his personal integrity. The reception of the speech was enough to convince Senator Tom Hennings of Missouri that Barkley's name should be presented to the convention despite his withdrawal. The eventual success of the candidacy still depended on the reaction of the delegates to Barkley's age and the progress of the Stevenson draft.

W. Averell Harriman

W. Averell Harriman's announcement in April that he would be a candidate for the presidency attracted little attention among politicians, who considered him to be a favorite son chosen to hold together the large New York vote; the general public seemed to know little about him.[77] Although he had served the Roosevelt and Truman administrations in eight important positions, at the start of his campaign he was not as well-known as some of the other candidates. Because of Truman's late withdrawal from the race and Harriman's apparently fruitless efforts to persuade Governor Stevenson to run,[78] it was late May before Harriman's campaign got started and newspapers began to report much about his activities.

Harriman, a New Deal-Fair Deal candidate, stood firmly on the winning, liberal program that President Truman warned the party never to discard. In interviews, in conferences, and in speeches, he declared himself to be running on the party record. He made no apologies. While other candidates appeared to distinguish between domestic and foreign policies, Harriman insisted that they are inseparable. He proposed an expanding economy at home and aid to the other countries of the free world. A friend of labor, he urged the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the enactment of a new law written in consultation with labor, enlightened industrialists, and the public to preserve the rights which labor won under Roosevelt and Truman. He favored a housing program and a strong farm price support system to maintain the standards of living attained by the American farmer in the last twenty years; he supported a compulsory Fair Employment Practice Commission on the national level with the various states accepting their full responsibility in eliminating discrimination. As a firm supporter of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Point Four Program, he argued that a strong, progressive domestic policy should enable the United States to continue its foreign policy of cooperative action to halt communism and to preserve the free way of life and world peace.[79]

As a latecomer to the campaign, Harriman and his advisers realized that he could not hope to equal the handshaking speaking tours of Kefauver.[80] Although Harriman became a frequent participant in television and radio programs and travelled to various localities

[76] *Vital Speeches of the Day*, XVIII, 20 (August 1, 1952), 621-623.

[77] "Patrician on the Sidewalks," *Time*, LIX (May 26, 1952), 23; Ernest K. Lindley, "Observations on Harriman," *Newsweek*, XXXIX (April 28, 1952), 27; "Harriman's Tactics," *Newsweek*, XXXIX (June 9, 1952), 27.

[78] "How The Democratic Bosses Plan Stevenson Coup," *Newsweek*, XXXIX (May 19, 1952), 29.

[79] The Harriman New York Headquarters presented the writer with texts of speeches, press releases, and campaign literature.

[80] *Time*, LIX (May 26, 1952), 24.

to deliver speeches, his strategy was to engage in the type of speaking at which he is most effective. He can be forthright and communicative when he talks in small intimate gatherings over a drink or at a dinner table. In his capacity as foreign administrator he developed skill in conference. For example, his informal briefings to the press concerning the programs he controlled were often the most useful discussions conducted by any public official, whereas his formal press conferences were often dreary and barren.[81] He used the informal conference technique to advantage in his campaign: he invited labor leaders to breakfast in his New York home;[82] he conferred with Senators and Representatives;[83] he held receptions and luncheons for such diverse groups as farmers and members of the Foreign Language Press;[84] and he toured many states to confer with delegates and political leaders. Some of his informal radio and television interviews have been vigorous and persuasive. The small, intimate audience situation in which he performs best was a significant aspect of his role as a campaigning politician.

In major addresses Harriman's appearances were not always impressive. He appeared to be a shy man with little eloquence and no glamour. On some occasions he seemed to lack the ability to communicate with his audiences. Consequently, Harriman has tried to achieve a "new look" in speechmaking. His advisers noticed that he spoke better off the cuff and advised him to throw away his scripts. Apparently, on hearing a transcription of one of his speeches, he was not satisfied with his delivery and set about to improve.[85] Rumors state that he sought the help of a speech teacher, but *Look* magazine reported that he sought only additional audiences to practice on.[86] Individuals working at his New York headquarters, however, revealed that he received some advice concerning speechmaking from Charles Collingwood of CBS and that Judge Samuel I. Rosenman assisted him with the Roosevelt Memorial Address that caused representatives from the iron curtain countries to leave the audience. Actually, Harriman does not read speeches well and admits it. He possesses a good memory and can speak at length without reference to notes, often illuminating his speeches with first-hand information about world leaders and world events which he alone is in a position to know. His voice is low and well modulated. In preparing his later speeches he apparently studied the material he wished to include, consulted with advisers, and then spoke without notes with more poise and assurance than on earlier occasions. At times, he lapsed into his old habits and mumbled or spoke with a halting, repetitious delivery that was not effective. He got his greatest response when he followed his new aggressive practices. For example, at Golden, Colorado, on June 28,

> Mr. Harriman amazed persons with the vigor with which he spoke before a big audience and the reception he received. His half-hour speech, in which he once more went down the line for complete New Deal-Fair Deal policies, was interrupted time and again with cheers and applause and he was cheered for a full minute at the end.[87]

[81] Theodore H. White, "Wise Man in Quest of Security," *New York Times Magazine* (March 16, 1952), 29.

[82] *Time*, LIX (May 26, 1952), 23.

[83] "Profiles," *The New Yorker*, XXVIII (May 3, 1952), 67.

[84] On June 6 and June 7, 1952, Mr. Harriman spoke at a luncheon for the Foreign Language Press; held a reception for labor leaders; spoke at a breakfast, luncheon, and reception for farm leaders and politicians of up-state New York; and participated in television and radio interviews.

[85] *Look*, XVI (May 17, 1952), 144.

[86] *Ibid.*

[87] Lawrence E. Davies, "Harriman Tells Eisenhower He'd Be Old Guard Captive," *New York Times* (June 29), 1, 32.

The effect of Harriman's campaign speaking is not easy to determine, but in the later stages of his campaign there were fewer reports that he is "no great shakes as a public speaker."[88] His defeat of Kefauver in the June election in Washington, D. C., may or may not have been related to speechmaking. As a campaign speaker his chief weakness is that he often lacks forceful, fluent delivery; and he has, at times, failed to vitalize the liberal, progressive program which he professes. Perhaps his persuasiveness with labor, farm, and political leaders would have become more evident in a continuing campaign.

Estes Kefauver

In the pre-convention campaign Estes Kefauver dramatized his fervent belief in grass-roots democracy. In many respects his stumping resembled the 1948 whistle-stop campaign of Harry Truman,[89] for the Tennessee senator concentrated more on handshaking, informal gatherings, and little speeches at the crossroads than upon major addresses in key cities. He entered sixteen preferential primaries; doubtless he worked harder and traveled more miles than any of his opponents.

In spite of the ridicule of the political wiseacres, Kefauver transferred to the national scene the direct neighborly techniques which he had first learned and tested in the hills and villages of Tennessee. He stopped people on the streets, in stores, in factories, in railroad stations, and introduced himself in a friendly way, "My name is Estes Kefauver. I am running for the presidential nomination, and I'd sure appreciate your help." At Omaha, Nebraska, he amazed the official welcoming committee by taking time to shake hands with the persons in the air terminal, including the janitor and a woman behind the newsstand.[90] During his intense Florida canvass, which has been referred to as "a casual informal performance," he was sometimes behind schedule because he insisted on visiting with passersby. He might stop his sound truck along a sandy crossroad and hail some astonished "presumed voter." Richard Stout, staff correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor*, observed, "As for crowds of a few hundred, tireless and apparently sincere Senator Kefauver circulates gregariously among them, observing simply, "I do hope you'll vote for me."[91]

The Tennessean also made his campaign a family affair. Pretty Mrs. Kefauver accompanied her husband on much of his barnstorming. Her utterances and activities were in excellent taste and always fitting the supporting role of a wife. She did little speaking. Even Kefauver's father joined his son in the Florida tour. Somewhat to the dismay of Senator Richard Russell, who is a confirmed bachelor, the Kefauvers circulated posters reading, "Elect a family man, Estes, Nancy, and the children." Richard Stout reported, "Six foot Estes, and winsome Nancy and Grandfather Kefauver all seemed to be having a good time. The show arouses an unmistakable fervor."[92] Edward Kernan, political writer for the Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, wrote concerning the Kefauvers in Ohio, "The Senator has been wooing the voters with appropriate speeches, handshaking, and the common man touch, while Nancy has been wowing

[88] Ernest Barcella, "The American Who Knows Stalin Best," *Colliers*, LXXIX (May 3, 1952), 60.

[89] Cole S. Brembeck, "Harry Truman at the Whistle Stops," *QJS*, XXXVII (February 1952), 42-50.

[90] *Christian Science Monitor*, March 29, 1952.

[91] *Ibid.*, May 1, 1952.

[92] *Ibid.*

them by just being pleasant, attractive Nancy."[93] But Mrs. Kefauver made speeches too, and many persons believe that she was as effective a vote-getter as her sober, bespectacled husband.[94]

Detailed analysis of many of Kefauver's speeches is impossible. Neither recordings nor printed texts remain of his off-the-cuff speeches, his impromptu answers, and his chance conversations, but these efforts probably constituted some of his most effective speaking and occupied much of his time in the primary contests. By these means he was able to set the tone of his campaign; that is, to emphasize that he was an amateur in politics, a simple, unaffected, friendly person, a family man, an intense believer in the wisdom of the people, and an underdog. This strategy of building his wife's ethical appeal, as well as his own, was his chief weapon against the Democratic stalwarts who opposed him.

Strenuous personalized electioneering did not deter the Tennessee senator from delivering several major addresses and appearing several times over radio and television. During his first three months, he is reported by one source to have delivered thirty major speeches and to have covered twenty-three states.[95] In the remaining two and a half months, which included his efforts in Florida, Ohio, and California, spanning the country from coast to coast, he probably spoke more often. Kefauver could not have filled his speaking engagements without the aid of air travel and remarkable physical stamina. For example, on April 16, he spoke to a joint meeting of the Institute of International Affairs and the Attorney General's Conference at Dallas, Texas. The following day he addressed the New York State Democratic dinner at the Waldorf Astoria in New York City. On April 21 he talked to the United Textile Workers, meeting at Miami, Florida. After two days of vigorous touring in northern Florida, he addressed a meeting at Norwalk, Ohio, April 25; and another in Akron, April 26. He appeared on Town Meeting of the Air in New York, April 27; the following day he spoke to the Junior Chamber of Commerce at Baltimore, Maryland; and on May 1, he appeared on a television program which originated in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Television provided Kefauver with at least three opportunities to appear with other presidential hopefuls on nationwide programs. The League of Women Voters chose him as one of the five aspirants to appear on a TV panel, which was televised during their national convention at Cincinnati, Ohio, on May 1.[96] More dramatic was his debate on May 5 with Senator Richard Russell via television from Miami, Florida.[97] The Miami *Herald* (May 6, 1952) reported that the two senators "stood flatfooted and traded their heaviest blows." In the interchange Kefauver forced the Georgia senator to declare that he would not bolt the party over the FEPC issue. A month later, on June 15, Kefauver met Senator Taft in a verbal slugfest on NBC's American Forum of the Air.[98]

[93] *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, May 2, 1952.

[94] Robert Wallace, "A Vote For Nancy," *Life*, XXXII (June 30, 1952), 100-107.

[95] Josephine Ripley, "Tennessee Homespun Boy Makes Good," *Christian Science Monitor*, May 2, 1952.

[96] "The Citizens' View of '52," at 8:00 P.M., over 41 ABC-TV stations and 125 NBC-radio stations. Other participants were Warren, Stassen, Kerr, and Harriman. Paul G. Hoffman represented Eisenhower. See special supplement of *Life*, "A Report on the Citizens' View of '52."

[97] The program was televised over WTVJ, Miami, Florida, 9:00 to 10:15, May 5, 1952. The forum included John McDermott of the Miami *Herald*, Bill Baggs of the Miami *News*, Don Larson of the University of Miami, and Ralph Reinick of WTVJ, who served as moderator.

[98] AP story, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, June 16, 1952.

The consensus is that the Tennessee senator handles himself well before the television cameras. Jack Gould, radio-TV editor of the *New York Times*, observed that "He is relaxed and keeps himself under control, but sometimes—fairly or unfairly—a viewer senses that his calm approach is planned."[99]

Kefauver's pre-convention strength was not found in the realm of ideas and logical proof nor in a new and dramatic program of reform. Quite to the contrary he kept his speeches vague and noncommittal. Many of his speeches in the form of press releases[100] are filled with generalities and are clothed in colorless language. In one of his first campaign utterances he said, "My whole political philosophy is one of progress."[101] This proposition was safe. On many occasions he suggested a more vigorous prosecution of the policies of the present administration. He praised the domestic programs of Roosevelt and Truman,[102] reasserted his disgust with corruption and crime, insisted on fulfillment of commitments abroad, recommended close cooperation of North Atlantic democracies, and the extension of the Point Four program. He presented himself as the friend of labor, of the farmer, and of the small businessman. He attempted to avoid the stigma of sectionalism by stressing that as president he would increase "economic and social gains . . . for all of the people," emphasizing that he meant Negroes as well as whites. He avoided attacks on personalities, particularly candidates for the Democratic nomination. Of course he showed no hesitancy in attacking Republicans.

Kefauver has never been considered a powerful public speaker. *Time* rates him as "one of the dullest, most fumbling speakers in the Senate."[103] Josephine Ripley calls his speaking "undramatic."[104] In a statement issued by the Kefauver Headquarters, Joseph Marshall says, "He [Kefauver] speaks much more like an informal college professor than a politician. . . . His style of composition [is] quite pedestrian and without brilliance. His speeches do not stir his hearers to any great enthusiasm, and they do put a small proportion of the audience to sleep."[105]

Seemingly he is best at speaking to small informal gatherings or at answering questions. Walt Murtagh of the Manchester (N.H.) *Union Leader* characterized his extemporaneous speaking as "his down-to-earth neighborly approach."[106] Professor Dallas Dickey, who heard Kefauver speak twice at Gainesville, Florida, says, "He appears a very calm individual and manifests a certain quiet persuasiveness. . . . One got the impression of fine physical resources and intellectual capacities."[107] Professor Gregg Phifer, who heard him at Tallahassee, Florida, observes that he has a "straightforward look about him and an air of simple, almost homely honesty."[108]

[99] Jack Gould, "The X of the Campaign—TV 'Personality,'" *The New York Times Magazine*, June 22, 1952, Sec. 6, pp. 14, 40. Also see John Crosby, "TV and the 1952 Election," *The American Magazine*, CLIII (April 1952), 21 ff.

[100] The National Kefauver Headquarters provided the writer with twenty-four texts of this type, dating from January 23, 1952, to May 7, 1952.

[101] Speech delivered at the Democratic Keynote Day, Detroit, Michigan, February 2, 1952. Text (press release) furnished by Kefauver Headquarters.

[102] He devoted most of his Cedar Falls, Iowa, speech, delivered July 4, 1952, to a eulogy of the New Deal. This speech was broadcast over KXEL, Waterloo, Iowa, 7:00-7:30 P.M.

[103] *Time*, LIX (March 24, 1952), 21.

[104] *Christian Science Monitor*, May 2, 1952.

[105] Statement provided the author by National Kefauver Headquarters.

[106] Manchester (N. H.) *Union Leader*, March 12, 1952.

[107] Letter to the author, May 15, 1952.

[108] Letter to the author, May 7, 1952.

No one can deny that Kefauver's campaign made him a significant Democratic possibility in 1952. With no political organization and a small campaign chest he succeeded in winning enough votes to demand attention and respect from his party. His speaking contributed to the impression he made, but his success was probably due more to his personal attributes, his skillful planning, and his hard work.

Robert S. Kerr

Long before Truman's now famous "I shall not be a candidate for re-election" speech, Oklahoma's senior senator was stumping the country for delegates "just in case." Therefore, his declaration of candidacy following the Truman speech was no surprise.

Six-foot-three-inch Bob Kerr is no newcomer to Democratic party circles. Except for Civil Rights and his pet gas bill his voting has been "party line" on major issues.[109] His keynote address at the 1944 convention set the tenor of the Democratic campaign for Roosevelt. His support of Truman's dismissal of MacArthur was loud and loyal. In short, he is a self-confessed administration advocate who expects to stand or fall on the record.

Kerr has been called a "modern Horatio Alger."[110] The comparison is interesting. Born in a log cabin near Ada, Oklahoma, in 1896, he led no silver spoon existence. He worked on the farm with his father, was educated in the public schools of Ada, and borrowed money to attend the University of Oklahoma. A member of the Field Artillery in the First World War, he became state commander of the American Legion in 1925. He studied law in Judge J. F. McKeel's office, passed the bar examination, and became McKeel's partner. In 1925 he went into the oil drilling business with his sister's husband and ultimately bought out the business. With the discovery of oil in Oklahoma City, Kerr's fortunes took a leap. In two hard-fought elections in 1935 and 1936 he assisted in gaining the right to drill in the state capital. His reward was a chance to drill wells for the Phillips Company. Staking his business on the principle that the way to get rich in the oil business is to take a share in the well instead of a fee for drilling, he began to amass a fortune. In 1942 he became Oklahoma's first native-born governor and six years later was sent to the U. S. Senate.

Kerr's background is deeply religious. A devout Baptist, he has taught Sunday School classes in Oklahoma City for many years. He is a firm teetotaler and advocates prohibition. He is devoted to his family: a daughter, Kay, three sons—Bob, Jr., Breene, and William—and Grayce Breene Kerr, whom he married in 1925.

As a campaigner Kerr constantly attacks the "bewitched, bothered and bewildered" Republicans and seldom misses a chance to attack the Hoover administration.[111] His platform for the Midwest has been "land, wood, and water." He has supported Point Four, 100% parity, low-cost housing, and attacked Taft-Hartley. On matters of civil rights, he straddles the fence by affirming the principles of equality but contending that such matters should be handled locally.[112]

[109] "If Not Truman, Who?" *Life*, XXXII (March 24, 1952), 128.

[110] "Hats in the Ring" NBC, June 22, 1952, 8:30 p.m. (CST).

[111] Robert S. Kerr, "The Republican Party is Bewitched, Bothered, and Bewildered," address before the Democratic Regional Conference in Denver, Colo., May 23, 1951. *The Congressional Record*, May 24, 1951.

[112] Robert S. Kerr, "Fair Employment Practices," a pamphlet released by Kerr's Washington office containing a statement made by Senator Kerr on the CBS radio network program, "Candidates and Issues," in response to the

Kerr is a product of Oklahoma's rough-and-tumble politics. He debated in high school and college and has always loved a contest. One of the most feared debaters on the Senate floor, he is particularly fond of shifting the burden of proof to his opponents.[113] Kerr's skill in recalling facts and in ridicule is used often in floor clashes.

His ethical appeal is supported by his rise from "the people" and his size and informality on the platform. In Oklahoma he stumps in shirt sleeves and suspenders. In some circles his wealth causes distrust. He attempts to answer by reminders that he earned, and did not inherit, the money.[114]

His political speeches are marked by many generalizations and assertions. "I say to you . . ." frequently introduces a sweeping statement of opinion or party principle. Evidence in political speeches consists of common facts and general opinions. He is especially fond of contrasting "Hoover's Depression" with "Democratic Prosperity." In Congressional debate and committee hearings his evidence is more factual, specific, and abundant.

Emotional appeals are predominantly directed at loyalty, national pride, reverence, security, hope, and pugnacity. As would be expected, he taps the Bible frequently and easily. Stump speeches include many "home folks" appeals.

The organization of his speeches is clear. His main points are usually topical in function and climactic in structure; the climaxes usually involve the Republicans and Hoover.[115]

Stylistically, his speeches are clear and framed in simple language readily grasped by his audiences. Apparently he does not alter his style for different types of audiences. It all has the flavor of "homely, friendly talk," sprinkled with many analogies drawn from the Bible, the oil business, the farm, and the life and remarks of Abraham Lincoln. The sentences are short and conversational. In debate he frequently answers questions with questions and makes liberal use of rhetorical questions in political speeches. Parallel structure frequently appears in perorations. Kerr is a master at coining satirical phrases such as the "Wherry-go-round," "MacArthuritis," etc.[116]

In preparing a speech Kerr likes to "talk it out" with a dictaphone or with a friend to act as a sounding board. The final product is often a combination of his work and that of special assistants.

Kerr's delivery is extempore and direct. He has a powerful baritone voice and speaks with what appears to be a "slow drawl with standard pronunciation." Occasionally a trace of "Okie" appears in his diction. He has a tendency, especially when reading a speech, to lapse into a mild ministerial melody. Gestures are easy and unstudied but not particularly athletic or violent. He leans on the stand and accents his remarks with repeated removal and replacement of his bifocals.

question: "Would you support a Federal Fair Employment Practices Law?"

113 "A Democratic Horatius," unpublished manuscript released by Kerr's Washington office, credits Blair Moody, U. S. Senate (Michigan) with saying that Kerr is "by all odds the most colorful rough-and-tumble debater in the Democratic corner" and has "ground some of the ablest Republicans to mincemeat in floor debate."

114 Kerr has several times defended himself on this issue. Examples are found in his appearance on NBC's program "Meet the Press," June 22, 1952, 9:00 p.m. (CST) and in a speech given to the National Press Club of Washington, Thursday, June 5, 1952.

115 An example of this is found in the Denver Speech when Kerr said, "The American people thought they were right when they repudiated the Republican leadership in 1932. After 18 years, they know they were right. They have walked back up out of the 'valley of the shadow of death . . .'"

116 *Ibid.*

This, then, is "Senator Bob"—a millionaire who followed his father's advice to make enough money before going into politics; a believer in getting into the stream and guiding the flow rather than trying to be a one-man-reformer; a confessed liberal and a practicing conservative; an old-fashioned hard-hitting campaigner; and an optimist who declared:

> Frankly, when I analyze my own chances and count the specific votes now pledged to me, I don't know how I can win. Yet when I analyze all the other candidates, and appraise their chances, and recognize the solid opposition against them, I don't see how I can lose.[117]

No novice in political operations, Kerr expected no quick and dramatic victory. Rather, his hope was

> . . . to become the first choice of as many delegates as possible, and then, to become the second choice of as many more as possible. . . . In view of the fact that there are going to be so many of the delegates disappointed by the failure of their first choice, I am convinced that this procedure not only has a lot of merit, but it just might make me the second choice of enough delegates to get the nomination.[118]

Richard B. Russell

Undefeated in thirty-two years of political life,[119] Senator Richard Brevard Russell of Georgia entered only one 1952 primary.[120] Despite the fact that outside Florida he did little popular campaign speaking, most southern delegates fell over themselves hastening to his support[121] and he had 268 votes on the first ballot in Chicago.

Russell's kickoff speech in Atlanta on April 25 was broadcast from coast to coast over 259 NBC stations.[122] Then came the Florida campaign, a May speaking tour from California[123] to Maryland,[124] and June conferences with western Democratic delegations. Invading the North, he sought support from politicians, civic leaders, and delegates.

Only in Florida did Russell slug it out in a popular primary; he traveled 2,245 miles[125] and spoke to demonstrative audiences in Gainesville, Tallahassee, Madison, Miami, and a hundred other points. Protecting his bald pate with an umbrella or wearing a tricorn hat to match Kefauver's coonskin,[126] he covered the state by bus, spent three hours and ten minutes shaking hands in Miami's Bayfront Park,[127] and sweated out (literally) a debate with Kefauver over WTVJ in Miami.[128]

Russell won the popularity contest, 367,980 to 285,358,[129] and took nineteen delegates to Kefauver's five. Since Florida was, in the popular phrase, discovered by Spaniards and settled by Georgians, the junior senator from Georgia

117 Speech to the National Press Club, *op. cit.*

118 *Ibid.*

119 Russell entered the Georgia House of Representatives in 1920, became Speaker in 1927. He was elected Governor of Georgia in 1931 and United States Senator in 1932. He has served in the Senate ever since and is now fifth in seniority. This and other information is summarized in a seventeen-page "Human Interest Sketch" distributed by Russell for President Headquarters.

120 Florida. Also in Nebraska William Ritchie ran and won as a Russell-pledged delegate. Atlanta *Constitution*, April 28, 1952. In an interview with Edward R. Murrow over the CBS Radio series, "Presidential Profiles" (April 24, 1952), Russell said, "I was very anxious to enter some of these other primaries, but I just couldn't leave . . . it just happens to be my job."

121 In Florida more than sixty candidates pledged to Russell campaigned for places in the twenty-four member delegation. Before the second primary, however, withdrawals and switches cut this top-heavy list to forty-two. Tallahassee *Democrat*, May 14, 1952.

122 Miami *Herald*, April 26, 1952.

123 Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, May 14, 1952.

124 Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce, June 2, 1952.

125 *Time*, LIX (May 19, 1952), 29.

126 "Heat Wave Hits the Political South," *Life*, XXXII (May 19, 1952), 29-33.

127 Miami *Herald*, May 5, 1952.

128 *Ibid.*, May 6, 1952.

129 Office of the Secretary of State of Florida, Capitol Building, Tallahassee.

found receptive audiences for the doctrine of states rights everywhere except in Miami.

For what does Russell stand? He stated his innocuous six-plank platform during his kickoff dinner in Atlanta:[130] (1) unity, (2) adequate national defense, (3) support for the Atlantic Pact and NATO, (4) budget-balancing economy, (5) honesty and loyalty in government service, (6) constitutional government.[131] In this last phrase, restated as "Jeffersonian Democracy," he was distinctive. He would limit the federal government to those powers specified in the constitution, all others being reserved to the states or to the people. Therefore he opposed the "compulsory jail sentence FEPC"[132] as a "system of government policing that tells the people whom they shall employ and promote."[133]

During his Florida campaign Russell attacked the Kefauver-supported Atlantic Union as "a new charter of government to supplant our own constitution" with "a new flag to fly above our own."[134] Over and over he insisted that he, a states-rights southerner, was a serious national candidate for president and had a good chance of being nominated and elected.[135] He defended himself against Kefauver's direct or implied charges that he was a machine candidate ("the only machine I look to for victory is you people out there")[136] and that he was in the race only for strategic reasons ("I am a candidate for the Democratic nomination for president of the United States, period.")[137]

Russell used much logical proof, mainly from his public record as Governor and Senator. He cited his budget-balancing in Georgia, his part in rural electrification, soil conservation, and the school lunch program, "one of my proudest achievements."[138] Ethical proof (gratitude toward and humility before the people of Georgia) filled the introduction of his kickoff speech in Atlanta. In the South his support for states rights and attacks on FEPC touched off automatic springs of response. Georgians and Floridians applauded Russell for the same reason they rise when Dixie is played. In the South Russell appealed to a unique sectional consciousness. In the North, capitalizing on his position as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, he substituted for his states-rights appeal the need for strength and unity in the face of communism.[139]

Russell's campaign speeches were systematically organized, with clear divisions and careful transitions. He stated his immediate purpose (the election of Russell-approved delegates in Florida,

[130] Atlanta *Journal and Constitution*, April 27, 1952. Interrupted by applause twenty-one times in twenty-two minutes, Russell was forced to omit part of his prepared text as distributed by Russell for President Headquarters. In presenting its copy the *Journal and Constitution* claims, "This is the text . . . as he delivered it."

[131] For a more specific and comprehensive statement of Russell's views see "Quizzing Russell," *U. S. News and World Report*, XXXII (June 13, 1952), 54-62. For his views on European aid and UMT see "Europe's Need: More Self-Help," *U. S. News and World Report*, XXXII (February 1, 1952), 28-33.

[132] Tallahassee *Democrat*, May 6, 1952.

[133] Speech in Orlando, Orlando *Morning Sentinel*, April 28, 1952.

[134] Speech in Gainesville, Miami *Herald*, April 27, 1952.

[135] "Yet, with all the honor and distinction Senator Russell has achieved in the service of his country as well as his State, nobody acquainted with politics in our country today would consider that the Russell movement is just a group of Democrats believing strongly in the candidacy of a very deserving candidate and striving militantly to get him elected." Claude Pepper, "The Influence of the Deep South Upon the Presidential Election of 1952," *The Georgia Review*, VI, 2 (Summer 1952), 130.

[136] Speech in Tallahassee, Tallahassee *Democrat*, May 1, 1952.

[137] Kickoff speech in Atlanta, Atlanta *Journal and Constitution*, April 27, 1952.

[138] *Ibid.*

[139] See, for example, Russell's speech before the Junior Association of Commerce in Baltimore. Distributed by Russell for President Headquarters.

for example) and ultimate objective (Democratic nomination and popular election). He arranged his discussion around the planks of his platform (Atlanta), the issues of his campaign (Tallahassee), or, in Altoona, Pennsylvania, the slogan of the Lions before whom he spoke: "Liberty, Intelligence, Our Nation's Safety."[140]

The Georgian's language was grammatical, with frequent images and catch phrases. He attacked the "hucksters of hysteria" dividing the people,[141] pictured the United States as "the only dike holding back the flood tide of communist revolution,"[142] and knew "of no accordion-like qualities which permit the Constitution to be expanded or contracted to meet the desires of any administration."[143] Spicing his speeches with infrequent humor, he cited Kefauver's "twelve-room suite right near the White House" and assured his audience that "that is as near as he will get to it."[144] He denounced FEPC as "one of the most dangerous brands of socialism, if not communism, ever proposed,"[145] and made much of "Jeffersonian Democracy," not always stopping to define it.

Russell has made his mark in the Senate as a skillful parliamentarian and able field general,[146] not as a rousing orator. Tall and broad-shouldered, this fifty-four-year-old bachelor is a sturdy but not over-prepossessing platform figure. His voice carries well and is of good quality. He drops terminal r's, slights medial ones, talks about the "guvment" and "presdncy," pronounces the "a" in *ultimatum* as in *mama*, but is easy to understand.[147] The *Time* phrase, "old Southern oratorical chant,"[148] is euphonious and somewhat descriptive of Russell's pitch and time pattern. Otherwise he has few characteristics of the southern politician stereotype: he is not rotund, does not drawl, has no sideburns, does not drink mint juleps. In fact, one widely circulated campaign picture shows Mother Russell handing him a glass of milk.

Until the convention, Russell's role remained something of a mystery. Some considered his a "protest candidacy,"[149] a "demonstration in force"[150] against any Democratic candidate or platform plank supporting national civil rights legislation. Was he the 1952 parallel to Calhoun's theory of concurrent majorities, armed revolt, and the two-thirds rule which until 1936 gave the South a veto at Democratic conventions? Dixiecrats hoped he would follow the lead of James S. Peters, chairman of the Georgia Democratic Executive Committee, who declared at Russell's kickoff dinner: "In the future . . . the South will sit at the head of the [Democratic] table, or I'll be damned if we sit at the table at all."[151] Russell himself, however, spoke of "tolerance and reason and fairness"[152] and sought to avoid the necessity for decision between Dixiecrats and loyal southern Democrats.

[140] Text distributed by Russell for President Headquarters.

[141] Speech in Altoona, Pennsylvania.

[142] *Ibid.*

[143] Speech before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, Miami *Herald*, May 15, 1952.

[144] Speech in Gainesville.

[145] Speech in Orlando.

[146] Illinois' Senator Paul Douglas called him "one of the most able field generals who ever appeared on the floor of the Senate." *Time*, LIX (May 19, 1952), 31.

[147] Recording made by WTAL, Tallahassee.

[148] *Time*, LIX (May 19, 1952), 31.

[149] Pepper, p. 130. He calls Russell's "protest candidacy" a "militantly determined effort to prevent the Democratic National Convention . . . from nominating a President and adopting a platform favoring 'civil rights.'"

[150] *Time*, LIX (May 19, 1952), 30.

[151] Atlanta *Journal and Constitution*, April 27, 1952.

[152] Interview with Murrow.

INTERPRETATION AND THE ETYMON

Dorothy Kaucher

A MAN once studied with separate joy each word of the dictionary. His original intention of assembling "definitions" was never realized; at the age of eighty he arrived at *zythum*, "the beer of ancient Egypt," and died with two more words to go—*zyzzomys*, "an Australian rodent," and *zyzzogeton*, "a South American leaf-hopper." His mind was a storehouse of disconnected facts; he had forgotten Francis Bacon's injunction, "Here, therefore, is the first distemper of learning when men study words and not matter."[1] Nor had he pondered I. A. Richards' statement, "There is no such thing as merely reading words; always through the words we are trafficking with things, things gone by, present, to come, or eternal."[2]

The interpreter's concept of words does not mean the dictionary in cold storage, the stuffing of minds with definitions. His concept follows Anatole France's dictum that the dictionary is the universe in alphabetical order; life—its meaning, its imagery, its emotion—lies behind the symbols that compose the word.

Much of the verbalizing today, however, is distressingly commonplace, or, like some modern poetry, so swathed in wrappings of the occult as to be practically unintelligible. An anonymous writer editorializes in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, "We moderns live in an intensely articulate society, but one which is articulate on a low plane, like caged monkeys who are never silent, but who certainly express little, though they express it often."[3] Ivor Brown also speaks of "the dreary prolixity of our own time, as it is splashed across the pages of official forms, reports, and governmental scripts of all kinds."[4] In our time the sense of words is running thin. Too often words lose their savor in the glib vocalizing of trite and mediocre subject matter. Whether speech is the messenger of the heart, as the Talmud says, or the picture of the mind, as Talleyrand declared, the beauty and vigor of words ought to be restored in this age of prolific speaking. Increased attention to the origin and history of words may lead to abiding satisfactions in the heritage of the English language.

In order to realize such rewards, the interpreter need not engage in verbal statistics nor ally himself with one of the organized theories of the origin of language—bow-wow, ding-dong, or pooh-pooh. He need only acquaint himself with the etymon, which to the Greeks meant "true meaning." His keen appreciation of words should not distract him to the by-paths of the word-fancier, nor should it deliver him to Cowper's

> Philologists who chase
> A panting syllable through time and space,
> Start it at home and hunt it in the dark
> To Gaul, to Greece, and into Noah's Ark.[5]

The interpreter is always motivated by a desire to carry words alive to an audience so that worthy thoughts and

Miss Kaucher (Ph.D., Cornell, 1928) is Professor of Speech, San Jose State College, San Jose, California.

[1] *Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. Basil Montagu (Philadelphia: Parry and Macmillan, 1859), I, 170.

[2] I. A. Richards, *How to Read a Page* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1942), p. 20.

[3] "Words That Have Been So Nimble," *SRL* XII (October 19, 1935), 8.

[4] Ivor Brown, *A Word in Your Ear* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1944), p. 10.

[5] William Cowper, "Retirement."

emotions should not die. The study of word origins should "bring the color, the bloom and aroma of words in their setting, a sense of meaning and a sense of beauty in verbal shape and sound. . . . To hunt words is to do no trespass. . . . They throw color on to the paper and make music in the air. Words are wind and fire."[6] Wilson's observation, "Thought lives on paper . . . having devised for itself an immortal and ever growing body"[7] explains the essence of words; they should speak from the mind and heart before they become vibrations of the vocal cords in the larynx.

The Reverend Richard C. Trench, examining chaplain to the Lord Bishop and Professor of Divinity, King's College, London, wrote in 1852,

> . . . the discovery of the fact that words are living powers has been like the dropping of scales from his [man's] eyes, like the acquiring of another sense or the introduction into a new world. . . . They [words] are not merely arbitrary signs but living powers . . . not like the sands of the sea, innumerable, disconnected atoms, but growing out of roots . . . connecting and intertwining themselves with all that men have been doing and thinking and feeling from the beginning of the world until now.[8]

Huse comments,

> Dante Alighieri is remembered and studied now . . . not because of his personal existence in time or place, but because of the thoughts and feelings he has recorded. The work itself is the present reality. And that work is only a series of symbols, something almost without weight or substance; lines, characters drawn on paper which can be significant only when deciphered in our own minds. . . . If its meaning, its present significance, its communicating power is lost, then the work itself disappears, or is like the extinguished voice or ashes of its author.[9]

I. A. Richards adds, "We do not read Shakespeare or Plato or Lao Tzu or Homer or the *Bible* to discover what their authors—about whom otherwise we know so little—were thinking. We read them for the sake of the things their words—if we understand them—can do for us. But understanding them . . . is using them to stretch our minds as they have stretched the minds of so many different readers through the centuries."[10]

A study of the etymon does introduce the student to a new world, does preserve words beyond the ashes of their authors, and does stretch minds. Such study helps the reader to a clearer understanding of the material he is to read aloud, sharpens the imagery, and stimulates his imagination in his approach to words. Possibly the most important values lie in the broadened appreciation of the best in the language at a time when not only the eyes but also the ears of the world are upon us. Obviously, a study of the etymon is only one part of the process of finding and communicating meanings and emotions to an audience.

Knowledge of the etymon of a word creates pictures. The word *read*, familiar to all of us seeking to bring words alive from the printed page, comes from Anglo-Saxon *raedan*, "to make out." The priest or head of the family picked up bits of wood from the white cloth on which they had been scattered. He then interpreted marks scratched on the pieces of wood, and forecast events. *Emphasis*, another familiar term, is best explained from its root meaning "to shine forth." *Stentorian*, from *stentor*, a herald at the siege of Troy, described by Homer as a "voice of bronze"; *tumidity*, from a word 2000 years old

[6] Ivor Brown, pp. 5, 21.

[7] Richard Wilson, *The Miraculous Birth of Language* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948), p. 22.

[8] Richard C. Trench, *A Study of Words*, 2nd ed. (New York: Redfield, 1852), pp. 10, 35.

[9] Howard Russell Huse, *The Illiteracy of the Literate* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1933), p. 242.

[10] *Op. cit.*, p. 50.

meaning "to swell" and today retaining the essential meaning "bloated"; *laconic* from the ancient Laconians, noted for their short, pithy speech; *amenable* from the verb of Roman hills "to drive animals—to lead"—all these words come alive if they are visualized in their origins.

Halcyon has been taken verbatim from the Greek for "kingfisher," which built its nest upon the sea and was believed to calm the waves as it hatched its eggs. Shelley's "Epipsychidion" pictures halcyons brooding "around the foamless isles."

Agnostic was coined by Thomas Huxley in the middle of the nineteenth century when the truth of the first chapter of Genesis was questioned by certain biologists. Thinking of the altar to an Unknown God Paul saw at Athens, Huxley coined *agnostic* from the Greek word meaning "unknown, unknowable." *Dinosaur* was coined by scientist Sir Richard Owen in the nineteenth century from the Greek meaning "fearful lizard," and *derrick* was derived from the name of Godfrey Derrick, professional hangman at Tyburn Prison, England, in 1600. *Gossamer* comes from a Middle English word meaning "goose-summer," when geese were in season for feasts, and filmy cobwebs floated in the air. *Protocol* has traveled down the centuries from Greece where it referred to a leaf glued to the case of a manuscript to indicate the contents. The student who defined *plagiarism* as "equal rights," might not have misunderstood had he known the Latin root meaning "kidnapping."

The use of the etymon to clarify meanings may also be illustrated in the study of literature from earlier times. *Disaster,* from the Greek root meaning "star," was used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as "ill-starred" happenings. Edmund in *King Lear* enlarges the idea, "We make guilty of our disasters the sun, moon, and the stars." *Damask,* from the Syrian city, Damascus, noted for swords, silks, linen, and pink roses, is used in the last sense in *Twelfth Night,* in reference to Viola:

> She never told her love
> But let concealment, like a worm i' the bud
> Feed on her damask cheek.

Ooze, is used by Ariel in *The Tempest* in its original sense, "water": "the ooze of the salt deep." *Annoy* from the Latin *in odio,* or "in hatred" was used by Queen Elizabeth when she wrote to the Earl of Cumberland, "We license our said cosyn to anoye the Kings of Spaine." "Bristling and frightful with a spiky menace" is the meaning of *horrid* intended by Milton in *Comus,* "Where very Desolation dwells/By grots and caverns shagged with horrid shades." The word *magazine,* originally Arabian for "storehouse" or "arsenal," carries that meaning in Thomson's *Seasons* describing the winds: "where are your aerial magazines reserved/To swell the brooding terror of the storm?"

In these foregoing words, clear meaning is only one result of a study of the etymon; another is the sharpening of images in the reader's mind. Joseph Conrad says:

> It is only through an unremitting, never discouraged care for the shape and ring of sentences that an approach can be made to plasticity, to colour, and that the light of magic suggestiveness may be brought to play for an evanescent instant over the commonplace surface of words, of the old, old words worn thin, defaced by ages of careless usage. My task, which I am trying to make you achieve is, by the power of the written word to make you hear, to make you feel—it is, above all, to make you see.[11]

[11] Joseph Conrad, *The Nigger of the Narcissus* (New York: Doubleday, 1949), p. xiii.

In 1589 Edmund Spenser wrote "The poet thrustest into the middest."[12] The student of words does the same thing when he considers the etymon.

Petulant, "butting as goats do," hence "ill-humored," is another example of the metaphorical origin of words, as is *muscle,* "little mouse." *Zest* originally meant "lemon peel." In the days of Pericles, *sarcasm* pictured the tearing of flesh by dogs. *Scrutiny* was originally "a careful search among broken pieces," and the tactile image of oil clarifies the derivative *unctuous.* An African tribe is said to have a word for toothache meaning "lion roaring in the mouth."

Cynic is related to the Greek for "snarling dog," *inculcate* to the Latin *calx,* "heel, a treading into," and *bombast* to the Latin *bombax,* meaning "cotton." In the Middle Ages *bombast* referred to padding for armor, in the Renaissance, stuffing for doublets. From this background, the modern application to an empty style of reading and speaking is obvious. *Propaganda* first meant "slip or shoot for transplanting," then "the multiplying of plants from slips," and then "the multiplying of certain ideas from brain shoots."

Agony recreates all the heroic pageantry of Greek contests at the annual festivals, which took place in the agonia, or assembly place. Since the struggle was often gruelling, the word *agony* arose from the suffering of the contestants. *Lyceum* was the Greek garden where Aristotle taught in Athens, next to the temple of Apollo, sometimes called the god Lyceios, or wolf-killer. *Diplomat,* from the Greek word for "doubling" or "folded twice," may, in some instances, seem peculiarly apt.

From *ephemeridae,* mayflies of the Aegean which lived but for an hour, was derived *ephemeral. Proselyte,* "a new convert," suggests a picture from the Greek root, "came toward." *Sycophant,* "parasite," reflects life in ancient Greece when sellers of figs swarmed in the market places. *Blackguard* invokes a scene from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries when greasy, unwashed men and women of the king's kitchen followed the glittering retinue with pots and pans as the king moved his seasonal residence. *Berserk* has descended from a heathen tribe of wild Norsemen who fought with frenzy in battles, yelling like animals and wearing only a *barsark,* or bear shirt. *Dunce* recalls the Renaissance, when followers of the great medieval schoolman, Duns Scotus, were held in contempt by many adherents of the New Learning and ridiculed as "Dunsmen" or "Dunses." *Sardonic* goes back to Sardinia, where the eating of a certain plant distorted the face; Greeks later applied the term to the bitter laugh which resembled the grimace. *Juggernaut,* in twelfth-century India, was a gigantic image of the god Vishnu. When moved in a wagon it was hauled by pilgrims who fainted, groveled in religious ecstasy, sometimes threw themselves under the wheels and were ground down relentlessly by the powerful force.

Finally, a study of the history of words gives perspective on the language as a whole. The words mentioned above illustrate the possibility of enlarging the outlook on language and arousing a sense of continuity in the mother tongue, as it has grown through the centuries. Such a perspective on words inevitably aids the oral reader in attaining the liberal, humanistic knowledge prized by Cicero.

Shipley expresses the belief that somewhere in the Near East they [the word ancestors of English] seem to have started, in that Garden of Eden of earliest man. By one

[12] Edmund Spenser, Prefatory letter to *The Faerie Queene,* in Paul Lieder, Robert Lorett, and Robert Rout, *British Poetry and Prose* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1938), I, 221.

path they wandered up rivers, breasting the Danube into the heart of Europe, roaming westward with the Teutons and the Anglo-Saxon speech. On other journeys they took the water route of the great midland sea. Along the shores of the Mediterranean, they lingered in Greece, they built the seven hills of Rome, and through the Romance language, rejoined the Teuton strains to form our English.[13]

Words thus trace the history of human fellowship. Trench comments:

> It was something for the children of Israel when they came into Canaan, to enter upon wells which they digged not, and vineyards which they had not planted, and houses which they had not built; . . . but how much more glorious a prerogative, for any one generation to enter upon the inheritance of a language, which other generations by their truth and toil have made already a receptacle of choicest treasures, a storehouse of so much unconscious wisdom, a fit organ for expressing the subtlest distinction . . . the largest thoughts and the loftiest imaginations which at any time the heart of man can conceive.[14]

A knowledge of word origins, then, may perhaps lead to a degree of dissatisfaction with dull or provincial interpretations of language. "Thrusting into the middest" of words can cultivate such pride in linguistic inheritance that the language may be handled with Horace's "profit and delight." A sincere pride in language can affect what men seek to do with the images inherent in the symbols; it may engender an integrity and a responsibility in the use of symbols by those who, in the words of I. A. Richards, "dare to finger the steering wheel of the universe."[15]

The words of Francis Bacon are apt for conclusion: "The images of men's wits and knowledges remain in books, exempted from the wrong of time, and capable of perpetual renovation . . . if the invention of the ship was thought so noble, which carrieth riches and commodities from place to place . . . how much more are letters to be magnified, which as ships, pass through the vast seas of time."[16]

[13] Joseph Shipley, *Dictionary of Word Origins* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1945), p. vii.
[14] Trench, p. 36.
[15] Richards, I, 170.
[16] Bacon, p. 20.

COMMENTARIES

COMPOUND WORDS

"Now that's just a difference in value-judgments," said the critic. Jay could see the sweat standing out on the hyphen. He began to pity the nouns, robbed of their privacy, hitched together by the sweating hyphens, to create a "group-tension" here, a "reality-situation" there, a "behavior-pattern" somewhere else. The American language was becoming as tiresome as the German. It was clinical. It was complex. It made an idea out of nothing, as French housewives were said to make soup. "I find that the interest-span is about forty minutes," said the college president. (But there was no such thing as an interest-span until he said that. Just as, in architecture, there was no such term as a "living-area." Somebody looked hard at two rooms and, persisting in finding a deeper meaning here than a bedroom and a sitting room, created a living-area.)—Pamela Frankau, *The Willow Cabin.* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1949), p. 246. Reprinted by permission.

THE EDUCATIONAL THEATRE AND UNESCO[1]

Henry Schnitzler

THE inauguration, five years ago, of the International Theatre Institute as one of UNESCO's Specialized Agencies had two significant implications. Above all, it meant the reaffirmation of the age-old concept of theatre as an educational and cultural force of the first magnitude; secondly, it emphasized the essentially international character of the stage and its tremendous potential as an agency of mutual understanding among the world's peoples.

Acknowledgment of the theatre in terms such as these recognizes the very reasons which have led to the conspicuous and in many respects unique development of the educational theatre in the United States. The acceptance of dramatic art as an integral part of the curriculum in literally hundreds of educational institutions expresses a two-fold purpose: first to serve the individual student by enriching his intellectual and emotional experience, by facilitating his understanding of human problems, by assisting him in the evaluation of social and psychological processes; then, to serve the community at large by providing its citizens with living drama of all times and all nations. This second purpose clearly indicates that the American educational theatre has extended the scope of its activities far beyond classroom and campus, carrying out functions which the professional theatre, partly because of its economic structure, partly because of its concentration in one city, has not always been able to fulfil.

Today, however, the educational theatre is faced with still another task which implies obligations not merely on a national but on an international scale. The urgency of this task has been fully realized by AETA, the American Educational Theatre Association. In order to stimulate activities and research, AETA initiated a Work Program which is carried out by a number of individual Projects. The most recent of these, and at the same time the one most intimately related to UNESCO, is the International Liaison and ITI Project which AETA asked me to organize two years ago. Its purpose is primarily to exchange information concerning theatrical activities carried on in educational institutions all over the world. However, by establishing contact with our colleagues abroad, we also hope to contribute to the spreading and strengthening of that concept of dramatic art which prompted UNESCO to organize the International Theatre Institute. It is this very concept which, in many countries, has found expression in government and city subsidized theatres and which, in the United States, led to the granting of a Congressional Charter to ANTA, the American National Theatre and Academy.

The inclusion of the letters "ITI" in the Project's title indicates one of our most immediate concerns; namely, to emphasize further AETA's fundamental

Mr. Schnitzler is Assistant Professor of Theater Arts at the University of California, Los Angeles; and Chairman of the International Liaison and ITI Project of the American Educational Theatre Association.

[1] Presented at the Theatre Panel of the Third National Conference of the U. S. Commission for UNESCO, Hunter College, New York City, January 28, 1952.

agreement with UNESCO's aims by closely cooperating with the International Theatre Institute and, wherever feasible, with its United States Center, namely with ANTA.

A report on the Project's work may best be attempted by briefly surveying the three main tasks it is committed to carry out. These are: 1. to obtain information on the educational theatre abroad; 2. to provide observers in foreign countries with information on the theatre in the United States; 3. to explore by what means AETA may effectively contribute to the task assumed by the International Theatre Institute.

In order to gather comprehensive data on all aspects of educational theatre activities throughout the world, a questionnaire was prepared which, in three separate sections, requests information on a wide variety of subjects, such as typical curricula adopted in countries where the theatre arts have been accepted as an integral part of the learning process; the educational use of opera, dance, children's theatre, and puppet shows; educational motion pictures as well as radio and television programs; the function of educational theatre in relation to the community; the vocational aspects of theatre arts curricula; the results of theatre, motion picture, radio, and television research; the existence and use of theatre and film museums, libraries, and collections; and recent developments in theatre architecture, stage design, and stagecraft.

This questionnaire was mailed, in bilingual form—English and French—to embassies of various countries in Washington, D. C.; to theatrical organizations and educational institutions abroad; to the various national centers of ITI; and to individuals who had expressed their readiness to serve as correspondents for our Project. The list of addresses includes, to date, fifty-one countries.

The compilation of this list was possible only as the result of an extensive correspondence which I have been carrying on for two years in order to make the necessary contacts abroad. It was encouraging to see that the mere statement of the Liaison Project's aims was greeted everywhere with immediate assurances of the most vivid interest. This was at once expressed also in more tangible form since, long before the questionnaire had been completed, information from all over the globe started to pour in, contained in literally dozens of personal letters, government reports, pamphlets, and periodicals, all volunteered in a spirit of enthusiasm and generosity which proved that individuals as well as organizations abroad felt the urgent need for an exchange of ideas and facts such as proposed by us.

The significance not only of the information received to date but also of the replies we may anticipate in response to the questionnaire, seems to me threefold. First, we are in a position to gather a vast amount of factual data, never before assembled in such completeness, on the use of the theatre arts in contemporary education. Second, by increasing our knowledge of conditions elsewhere, we arrive at a more satisfactory clarification of our own task in terms not only of its peculiarly American environment but also of its international implications.

Finally, the encouraging response to our first inquiries testifies to what a recent State Department Report to the United States Advisory Commission on Information calls "the tremendous appetite for knowledge from America."[2] The

[2] *The World Audience for America's Story*, U. S. Department of State, Publication 3485, International and Cultural Series No. 5 (Washington, 1949), p. 107.

American Educational Theatre Association, through its International Liaison Project, may be in a position to at least partially satisfy that appetite.

What is particularly urgent at this time, as many observers have recognized, is to provide information on American cultural achievements. Much, possibly too much, is known abroad about the material standard of living in the United States. In a *Round Table Discussion on the Basic Elements of a Free, Dynamic Society*, held recently in New York, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, President of the Ford Foundation, said: "I don't feel that America should apologize because we have vast numbers of automobiles, telephones, bathtubs. They are important. But if there is any misunderstanding of America abroad, it is because of the unconscious emphasis placed upon those tangibles."[3] To counteract the unfortunate but understandable reactions to this emphasis, steps have indeed been taken to acquaint the rest of the world with American literature, art, and music. The theatre, however, has not been used sufficiently for such purposes. On the other hand, we ought to realize how essential it would be to disseminate accurate information on the American stage, especially—and for definite reasons—on the educational theatre. What are these reasons?

Other nations, in particular those of Europe, have, by virtue of their own dramatic tradition, been accustomed for centuries to base their appraisal of any country's cultural achievements, in part at least, on the state of its theatre. The stage has always been to them infinitely more than just a means of momentary entertainment and its condition is therefore considered singularly representative of a nation's intellectual climate. While theatres aiming primarily at commercial success exist everywhere in the world, in most countries they are not permitted to remain the only form of theatrical enterprise, and care has been taken to establish others whose efforts serve predominantly educational ends. The term "educational" is used here in a sense that may be grasped immediately by merely recalling the fact that in France, for instance, the *Comédie Française*, as well as other government subsidized theatres, are under the direct jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education.

What do observers in foreign countries know about the American theatre? Hardly anything. And what they happen to know is designed to foster misunderstandings and prejudices rather than to eliminate them. The few foreign books dealing with the subject are either dated,[4] or incredibly inaccurate. As an illustration, I quote a few choice samples from the most recent foreign book on the American stage, published two years ago in Germany.[5] The author, Carl Ritter, finds that some American playwrights are preoccupied with problems of mental illness. To prove his point, he mentions *Idiot's Delight*.[6] We are also told that *Venice Preserved* belongs to a group of 18th century farces which have never been printed;[7] and

[3] Chester I. Barnard, and others, *Condensed Record of a Round Table Discussion on the Basic Elements of a Free, Dynamic Society, Held Under the Sponsorship of the Advertising Council* (New York, 1951), p. 77.

[4] Cf. Joseph Gregor and René Fülöp-Miller, *Das amerikanische Theater und Kino* (Vienna, 1931); Stephan Schlossmacher, *Das deutsche Drama im amerikanischen College und Universitaetstheater*, (Die Schaubuehne 15; Emsdetten, 1938); Léonie Villard, *Le Théâtre américain* (Paris, 1929); Jennie Waugh, *Das Theater als Spiegel der amerikanischen Demokratie* (Neue deutsche Forschungen 91; Berlin, 1936).

[5] Carl Ritter, *Amerikanisches Theater. Vom Rampenlicht zum Scheinwerfer* (Hamburg, 1949).

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

learn that Eugene O'Neill wrote a play called *Beyond the Blue Horizon*.[8]

Although, fortunately, such appalling ignorance is rare, all those who have written on the American theatre, whether well-informed or not, invariably agree on one point: on a violent condemnation of "Broadway" which to them is the very symbol of what has so frequently been called this country's deep-rooted commercialism and materialism. We might as well face the uncomfortable fact: Broadway does not have a very good international reputation. Any indignant reaction to a statement such as this may at once be tempered by emphasizing that the denunciation of Broadway is not at all directed at its superior achievements in acting and production. No one abroad is trying to deny the high standards of the professional theatre in New York City. Yet, the operating methods of the investment theatre are sharply criticized and—which is more important—they are regarded as representative of the American theatre as a whole. Consequently, "show-business" is at once interpreted by biased and ill-informed observers as one more proof of America's "lack of culture."

There is no need to point out why such judgments are superficial, nor why information on the American theatre is incomplete as long as it remains restricted to the New York stage. It would therefore be an urgent task to round out the picture by telling our friends throughout the world above all that negative criticism of certain less gratifying aspects of commercialism in the theatre has, for decades, been quite outspoken in this country too, and secondly, that there exists in the United States also a type of theatre whose main concern is not the pocketbooks but the minds of men; namely, the educational theatre. However, no concerted effort has been made so far to acquaint observers in other countries with its activities.

This is all the more striking since we have had unmistakable indications of the great interest that exists abroad in the American theatre outside of New York. Many of us have been in a position to watch the reactions of the numerous foreign visitors, invited by the State Department and guided by ANTA to study American theatre conditions, who in recent years have been guests on our campuses. They were profoundly impressed by what they saw. While we might be inclined to dismiss their complimentary remarks as merely polite gestures, we cannot disregard the statements published by some travelers—among them men like André Maurois and Armand Salacrou—after their return home.[9] That the function of the American educational theatre had been fully understood may be demonstrated by the following intriguing observation: The occasional excellence of the professional theatre, by no means overlooked by our guests, did not prevent them from refuting the commercial system; on the other hand, the obvious and partly inevitable shortcomings of the educational theatre did not prevent them from realizing its significance. Why do foreign critics feel that the nonprofessional theatre, crude and immature

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

[9] Cf. André Maurois, "Etats-Unis 1948," *Les oeuvres libres*, XXXIII (15 fevrier, 1949), 87; Catherine Valogne, "Armand Salacrou nous parle de l'avenir du théâtre américain," *Arts* (Paris), January 28, 1949; see also Hanns Braun, "Amerikanisches Theater," *Sueddeutsche Zeitung*, (Munich), August 22, 1951; Léon Chancerel, "Théâtre des Jeunes, Théâtre de l'Avenir," *Le Courier de l'UNESCO*, IV, 4 (April 1951), 11; J. E. Morpurgo, *American Excursion* (London 1949), p. 75; Bruno E. Werner, "Sind die Amerikaner ein Theatervolk?" *Die Neue Zeitung* (Munich) June 16, 1951.

as it may be at times, holds greater promise than the finish and glamor of Broadway? Why could Armand Salacrou, one of the most distinguished French playwrights of our time, state that, in his opinion, the future of the American theatre lies in the hands of the universities?[10] Because what obviously counts in the opinion of our visitors is not so much the immediate, actual, achievement seen in a given production but rather its fundamental concept. It is hardly necessary to add that this concept is, once again, precisely that which has prompted UNESCO to concern itself with the stage and to acknowledge it, as Dr. Torres Bodet expressed it in his message to the 1949 Congress of ITI, as "one of the most powerful agents for the education of the masses."[11]

The foregoing considerations have prompted the second task of the International Liaison Project. We are preparing a pamphlet, designed to provide a comprehensive, factual survey of the present state of the theatre in the United States. Its twelve Sections, written by a staff of experts, will deal with all areas of theatrical activity in this country, including the professional and the nonprofessional theatre; opera; dance; children's theatre; theatre architecture; stage design; theatre research; theatrical unions; and theatrical criticism. A final chapter is devoted to ANTA, its achievements to date as well as its future tasks. The entire publication is frankly and admittedly intended to serve as an instrument of cultural propaganda, not by painting a rosy dream image but by providing objective information on conditions as they actually are and, moreover, by outlining the social and economic developments—little known abroad—that have caused them.

Although the Liaison Project's activities described so far are obviously related to UNESCO's concern with international dissemination of knowledge in all fields of human endeavor, a few concluding remarks may indicate our third task, namely to devise ways and means of direct cooperation with ITI.

As a matter of fact, the relationship between ANTA and ITI has developed in a highly gratifying manner. At the Fourth International Theatre Congress held in Oslo in June 1951, a Resolution was passed, recognizing the importance of the work accomplished by our Liaison Project and asking AETA "to put at the services of ITI the results of its inquiry."[12] This means no less than that the American Educational Theatre Association has been designated as official clearinghouse to deal with matters related to the educational theatre all over the globe, an office that will lend itself automatically to the effective implementation of the UNESCO idea.

One of the means to achieve this end will be cooperation with ANTA. In at least two instances, such cooperation has actually started. The first concerns International Theatre Month, organized by ANTA, an event in which last year several hundreds of educational theatre groups participated.[13] The second is related to the guidance program designed by ANTA for the benefit of foreign visitors. During the last year, all of us have welcomed the opportunity of assisting our guests in their study of

[10] Catherine Valogne, *loc. cit.*; see also Armand Salacrou, "A Message to the American Educational Theatre," *Educational Theatre Journal*, III, 1 (March 1951), 1.

[11] International Theatre Institute, *Report on the Second Congress, Zuerich, June 27 to July 2, 1949;* Document ITI/2 C/ Rep. 1 (Paris, 1949), p. 8.

[12] "Conferences and Meetings," *Educational Theatre Journal*, III, 3 (October 1951), 272.

[13] Cf. Rosamond Gilder, "International Drama Month, *New York Times*, March 4, 1951.

American theatre conditions by arranging for the attendance of classes, performances, workshops, and discussion groups with instructors and students alike.

I can only mention in passing other areas where direct cooperation between the educational theatre and ITI has either been realized or where it ought to be started as soon as possible. The scheduling of a Children's Theatre Conference held in Paris, in April 1952, testified to ITI's concern with the potential of this exceedingly important instrument for international understanding which, on the national level, has become one of ANTA's most promising activities.[14] Another field of cooperation should be the exchange of companies. At the International Theatre Week held annually for the past three years in Erlangen, Germany, university companies from all European countries presented plays while the United States, although officially sponsoring the event, was conspicuously absent; a fact which caused much unfavorable comment abroad.[15] Still another opportunity presents itself in the Script Exchange Program. In this respect, the educational theatre, by collaborating with language departments in our universities, could make a very tangible contribution by providing and distributing translations.[16]

What the International Liaison and ITI Project has achieved so far, is very little indeed. However, even these modest beginnings have made us realize that the educational theatre is faced with a new and formidable task. Eight years ago, the late Arthur Hopkins wrote: "When the theatre becomes a world exchange of mutual understanding, it will take a place in future life not restricted to diversion. There are much more exciting and rewarding objectives in the future world than quickly forgotten applause."[17] Indeed, there are. And their urgency should be more obvious today than ever before.

[14] Cf. Martha Brush, "Seventh Annual Children's Theatre Convention," *Educational Theatre Journal*, III, 3 (October 1951), 192 ff.

[15] Cf. Hubert C. Heffner, "Two International Theatre Conferences, *Educational Theatre Journal*, III, 3 (October 1951), 224 ff.

[16] Rosamond Gilder, "ITI Congress in Norway Emphasizes Role of the Theatre in Furtherance of International Understanding," *U. S. National Commission, UNESCO News*, V, 2 (August 1951), 12.

[17] Arthur Hopkins, "New World Theatre," New York *Times*, July 8, 1945.

COMMENTARIES

"THE CHALLENGE"

UNESCO is the symbol of a great crusade for peace by nations, large and small, whose leaders believe that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."

"Ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause throughout the history of mankind," reads the preamble to UNESCO's constitution, "of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war. . . ."

UNESCO's task, then, is to promote understanding among all these peoples . . . to help remove the tensions which lead to war . . . to foster cooperation among nations in all efforts which seek better living standards and a fuller life.—"UNESCO: What It Is, What It Does, What You Can Do to Help." Department of State Publication 3225. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1948).

THE EVOLUTION OF HAWAIIAN ORTHOGRAPHY

C. M. Wise, Louisiana State University
and
Wesley Hervey, University of Hawaii

BEFORE January 18, 1778, the Hawaiian branch of the Polynesian language had no alphabet, hence no orthography. On that day Captain James Cook of the British Navy, commanding the sloops *Resolution* and *Discovery*, by sheer chance came upon the Hawaiian Islands. He named them the Sandwich Islands after the Earl of Sandwich, First Lord of the Admiralty, and "gave the discovery to civilization."[1]

For this, his third voyage, Cook had been commissioned to sail around Cape Horn to the South Sea Islands, thence north to New Albion, as the Pacific Northwest of America was then called,[2] and thence home through the hoped-for Northwest Passage. The Hawaiian Islands lay in his path between Tahiti and New Albion. On the day of the discovery, he recorded the name of the island of his first landing as *Atooi*, which was what he seemed to hear the islanders say for *a Kauai*. Since the Hawaiians had no writing, and since no one had ever before established contact with them, this was the first time any Hawaiian word had been written down.

Cook had already accorded to the languages of previously discovered Polynesian islands a rough, inconsistent, quasi-phonetic spelling in Latin characters. In his journal of the earlier part of this same voyage he listed such Tahitian place and personal names as the following: *Otaheite ('o Tahiti)*,[3] *Ulietea ('o Raiatea)*, *Huaheine (Huahine)*, *Bolabola (Borabora)*, *Opoony ('o Puni)*, *Otoo ('o Tu)*, *Otaha*, *Maheine (Mahine)*. In view of the similarity between the Tahitian and Hawaiian branches of the Polynesian tongue,[4] Cook must have found himself following somewhat familiar patterns in Hawaii, both in 1778 and a year later, on his return from Bering Strait after his failure to find the Northwest Passage. He wrote in his journal[5] the names of the islands thus: *Oneehow ('o Ni'ihau)*, *Woahoo ('o 'Ahu)*, *Oreehoua ('o Nihoa)*, *Owhyhee ('o Hawai'i)*, *Mowee (Maui)*, *Tahoora (Ka'ula)*, *Atooi (Kaua'i)*. He also recorded such words as *hamaite*[6] *(hao*, iron; *maika'i*, good); *toe (koekoe*, scratch, rasp); *tarro (kalo, taro*, a plant with an edible tuber); *Terreoboo (Kalaniopu'u*, the name of a chief).

Mr. Wise (Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1932) is Professor of Speech at Louisiana State University. He has been editor of QJS *(1934-1938) and President of the Speech Association of America (1942). He was Visiting Professor of Speech at the University of Hawaii in 1949-1950, and he is spending the current academic year (1952-1953) at the University of Hawaii on leave from Louisiana State University. Mr. Hervey (M.A., Hawaii, 1951) is Instructor in Speech at the University of Hawaii.* *This paper was read by C. M. Wise at the Fifth University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference at Lexington, Kentucky, April 26, 1952.*

[1] Hugh Reginald Haweis, *The Third and Last Voyage of Captain Cook* (London and New York: Routledge, 1886), p. 75.

[2] Cook's instructions were to intersect the coast of New Albion at 45° N., approximately the latitude of Salem, Oregon.

[3] The apostrophe used with Polynesian words herein signifies the glottal stop.

[4] Some principal branches of Polynesian are Hawaiian, Maori, Samoan, Tuamotu, Marquesan, Mangarevan, Rarotongan, Tongan, Easter Island (Rapanui), Tahitian, and Kapingamarangi.

[5] Haweis, pp. 80, 125.

[6] Haweis, p. 79. Both *hamaite* and *toe* were words used by the natives in asking for iron, since Cook used nails for barter.

Neither in Tahiti nor in Hawaii did Cook recognize the subject indicator particle *'o* for what it is; instead, he took it to be a part of the word itself, as in each of the first four of the island names.[7] He had made the same false assumption regarding the *'o* in the name *Otaheite ('o Tahiti)* and many other Tahitian words.

On February 14, 1779, three of Cook's officers entered in their journals the story of their commander's death on Kealakekua Bay, Island of Hawaii. One of these was Captain Charles Clarke[8] of the *Discovery*, who tried his hand at sundry Hawaiian words such as *Caricakooah (Kealakekua), arei (ali'i,* chief, nobleman). Another was Lieutenant James King, who spelled Hawaiian words in that part of his journal recounting Cook's death[9] very much as Cook spelled them, with evidently similar mishearings: *Karakakooa (Kealakekua); Akona ('a Kona,* a district in Hawaii); *Kaoo (Ka'u,* name of a chief, also a district in Hawaii); *Koah (Koa,* name of a chief, also a species of wood); *Earee (ali'i); Orono ('o Lono,* the god of harvest); *Terreeoboo (Kalaniopu'u); Harre-no-Orono (Hale no Lono,* house of Lono); *Maiha-Maiha (Kamehameha,* the name of the king). The third was twenty-two-year-old George Vancouver.[10] Vancouver was to return to Hawaii in 1792, 1793, and 1794. His spelling of Hawaiian resembles Cook's, but shows deviations of mishearing and personal inventiveness. In a letter of November 14(?), 1794,[11] he wrote, *Karakakooa (Kealakekua); Tamaah Maah (Kamehameha); Kahow Modoo (Kalanimoku,* Kamehameha's prime minister). Elsewhere[12] Vancouver wrote, e.g., *Tahowman-noo (Ka'ahumanu,* one of Kamehameha's queens); *Tarrata no Owhyhee (Kānaka no Hawai'i,* people of Hawaii).

Such attempts to apply English spelling to Hawaiian must have continued all through the forty-two years prior to the arrival of the missionaries in 1820. Personal preference or illiteracy sometimes affected the choice of spelling, as when John Young, a stranded American soldier who spent forty-six years as right-hand man to King Kamehameha and his successors, made this entry in his journal:

> Aprile the 13th, 1808. To rents for Stwrts Childring 10 taprs & 13 fethers. To rents from Halavr 5 taprs. No dogs. No fethers.[13]

If *soda* was *sodar* at home, John Young evidently concluded that *tapa* was *tapar* in Hawaii.

Another right-hand man of Kamehameha was an amazing Spaniard, Francisco de Paula y Marin, whose passion was agriculture and whose avocation was periodically giving his Hawaiian wife what he referred to as "a good beating." In his journal, under dates extending from 1809 to 1821, appear the attempts of its author to spell Hawaiian words in the Spanish fashion: *Quayquiqui (Waikiki), Whoaju ('o 'Ahu*—English and Spanish mixed), *Veji (Hawai'i), Quecuacarani (Kekuakalani,* a cousin of the king), *Vegi (Hawai'i), Ataquey (Kaua'i).*[14]

The French explorer Bougainville,[15]

[7] Neither did he recognize the *a* of *Atooi* for *to* or *as far as.*

[8] Quoted in Sidney Clark, *All the Best in Hawaii* (Dodd, Mead, 1949), pp. 87-88.

[9] Haweis, pp. 132 ff.

[10] William Bligh, who was to figure in the *Bounty* mutiny, was with Cook at this time also.

[11] Facsimile in George Godwin, *Vancouver,* Appleton, 1931, facing p. 116.

[12] Quoted by Godwin.

[13] Quoted from Clark, p. 116. Young's complete journal is available in the Honolulu Archives. *Taprs (tapa, kapa,* bark cloth, pluralized as if in English); *Halavr (Halawa,* a village).

[14] List quoted from Clark, pp. 117-122. Marin also tried his hand at spelling English words in Spanish: *guysque* (whiskey), *Guyteni* (Whitney), *Rugles* (Ruggles), *Bigum* (Bingham).

[15] Louis Antoine de Bougainville, *Voyage Autor du Monde,* Tome Second (Paris: chez Saillant & Nyon, 1772), pp. 413 ff.

who antedated Cook in Tahiti, naturally spelled his Polynesian (Tahitian) words in the French manner: *aouero* (egg), *aounerere* (black), *ateatea* (white), *eatoua* (God), *mate* (kill), *mea* (thing), *opoupoui* (drink), *pai* (boat), *po* (day), *roa* (big), *tane* (man), *atai* (one), *arona* (two), *erima* (five), *ahiva* (nine), *aronatao* (forty).

Between the time of Cook and the arrival of the first missionaries[16] on the brig *Thaddeus*, March 19, 1820, nothing appears to have been done to improve the orthography of such Hawaiian words as were written down in journals, in logs and explorers' accounts, and on maps. Many ships called at the island ports, many whalers wintered in the islands, and some few *haoles* (foreigners, strangers, hence Caucasians) settled there. Trade pidgin was coming to be known.[17] New words were hammered out by main strength in any combination of letters that seemed to a given writer to suggest an approximation of what he thought he heard.

At first the missionaries followed suit, imitating and inventing. Their spelling of the names of the five New England-educated young Hawaiian converts to Christianity,[18] three of whom accompanied them on the *Thaddeus* as teachers of the Hawaiian language and as interpreters and assistants, illustrates their practice: *Obookiah ('Ōpūkaha'ia), Hoopoo (Hopu), Tamoree (Kaumuali'i), Honoovee (Honoli'i), Kennooee (Kanui).*

In her journal[19] Mrs. Holman used many Hawaiian words such as the following: *tapper*[20] *(kapa, tapa); Krimokoo (Kalanimoku); tarrow (kalo, taro); Mowa (Maui); Tamoree (Kaumuali'i); mahkah-mah-kah (maika'i-maika'i,* good, good); *miti palla-palla-hanna-hanna (maika'i palapala hana, hana,* good reading work; i.e., work at reading is good); *poa (poi,* taro paste); *tarboo (kapu, tabu); pulla-pulla (palapala); nooe-nooe (nui-nui,* big-big).

The log of the *Thaddeus*, called the "Journal of the Sandwich Mission,"[21] contains similar spellings: *miti (maika'i), Rehoreho (Liholiho), Mowe (Maui), Crymokoo (Kalanimoku).*

The early spelling of the missionaries, as recorded in the foregoing, was due to take a sudden and radical change for the better. For January 1, 1822, the "Journal of the Mission"[22] contains an epoch-making entry:

ALPHABET OF THE LANGUAGE

We received . . . two copies of the New Zealand Grammar and Vocabulary; and were happy to see at once such a striking resemblance between the languages of the Sandwich and Society Islands. This work will afford us considerable aid in settling the orthography of this language. We are confirmed by it, in some measure, in the choice we had made of five vowels, viz. a as in father, e as in hate, i as ee in feet, o as in pole, u as oo in boot, and ai for the sound of the English i. These five vowels, with twelve consonants, (b, d, h, k, l, m, n, p, r, t, v, w,) will be sufficient to express, with very little variation, all the sounds in the language, which we have yet been able to analyze. Indeed, seven consonants, with five vowels, might very well serve for the notation of the language. The b, d, r, t, and v, might

[16] The Rev. Hiram Bingham and wife Sibyl; The Rev. Asa Thurston and wife Lucy; Daniel Chamberlain, farmer, wife Jerusha and five children; Thomas Holman, physician, and wife Lucia; Samuel Ruggles and wife Nancy, teachers; Elisha Loomis, printer, and wife Maria; Samuel Whitney and wife Mercy, teachers.

[17] The first island word recorded by Lucia Holman in her journal, March 14, 1820, p. 19, was *cow-cow (kaukau),* pidgin for *eat.* (The Hawaiian word is *'ai.*)

[18] *A Narrative of Five Youths from the Sandwich Islands* (New York: J. Seymore, 1816). Subtitle contains names as they appear herein.

[19] "Journal of Lucia Ruggles Holman," Special Publication No. 17, Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, Honolulu: 1931, pp. 18 ff.

[20] Mrs. Holman's husband wrote both *tappa* and *tapper* in his "Journal."

[21] Written jointly by Hiram Bingham, leader of the group, and Elisha Loomis, the printer. Words used here taken from entries of April 1, 1820, ff.

[22] In the *Missionary Herald*, XIX (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1823), 41.

be omitted; for, though their sounds are heard, and it is believed they would be of use, their places might be supplied, by using the p invariably for b and p, the l for d, l, and r, the k for k and t, and the w for w and v.

On January 7, 1822, only six days after the arrival of this important book, Loomis set his printing press into operation and struck off the first printing ever done in Hawaiian, viz., the alphabet, some spelling lessons, and some selections for reading. As the excerpt following will show, the spelling thus made great leaps forward from the more or less infantile forms previously used. The principal advance was in respect to the vowels. The missionaries, greatly to their credit, had determined among themselves to use *a, e, i, o, u* with their Latin values, but it is important too that the New Zealand book confirmed them in this choice.

First Exercise in Reading

E hele mai oe.
E noho marie oe i loko o ka hale.
E hana pono, a ore hana heva iti.
E hoo lohe i ka mea a ko kumu i i mai la.[23]

This year an Englishman, William Ellis,[24] arrived from six years' missionary work in Tahiti and the other Society Islands. Ellis had had a great deal of experience with Polynesian spelling, but since he did not arrive until April 7, 1822, he could not have influenced Loomis' spelling on January 7.

As will appear later, Ellis had considerable influence in the final determination, not merely of the Hawaiian vowels, but also of the consonants. He had read John Pickering's work on establishing the orthography of American Indian languages.[25] Bingham mentions the essay too,[26] and undoubtedly Loomis and perhaps others knew of it.[27] This essay is based upon Peter S. Duponceau's *English Phonology*,[28] of which Pickering says, "Those who are acquainted with Mr. Duponceau's essay on English phonology will perceive, that the present paper is only an application of the general principles that are there stated, to the class of Indian languages." The principles to which he refers are expressed in the following quotation from Duponceau: "The correct pronunciation of a language cannot be preserved unless it is precisely fixed and ascertained, and that cannot be done unless all its component sounds are accurately known and clearly distinguished from each other."[29] Duponceau's implication here is exemplified by his ultimate attempt[30] to contrive a list of infallible key-words, each beginning with one of the twenty-seven sounds (Duponceau's count) of the English language. Examples: *oomin* for /u/, *fesh* for /f/. Duponceau was groping toward the idea of one sound (that is, one phoneme) for each symbol and one symbol for each sound. Without having a name for it, he had an embryonic concept of the phoneme. His suggestion of an essentially phonemic method of approach would have been invaluable to Pickering in writing on Indian languages, and to Bingham, Loomis, Ellis, *et al.*, in building an alphabet for Polynesian. Even though the missionaries received Du-

[23] Copy in Hawaiian Mission Children's Library, Honolulu.

[24] William Ellis, *A Narrative of a Tour Through Hawaii* (Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette Co. Ltd., 1917); *The Advertiser Historical Series*, No. 2, p. 42.

[25] John Pickering, AAS, "An Essay on a Uniform Orthography for the Indian Languages of North America," *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* (Cambridge: University Press, 1820).

[26] Bingham, p. 155.

[27] Since an original copy of Pickering's essay is in the Bishop Museum in Honolulu, it probably was available in 1822.

[28] Peter S. Duponceau, *English Phonology* (Philadelphia: Abraham Small, 1817).

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 87-58.

ponceau's idea only through Pickering, the idea was nevertheless golden and led them in the end to excellent conclusions. Pickering had demonstrated that, as a practical method of carrying out Duponceau's principles in the orthography of American Indian languages, the continental, rather than the English and American values of the Latin alphabet should be used. In the following quotation, Ellis[31] uses only continental values of the vowels:

> A [in Hawaiian] is always as *a* in father, or shorter as *a* in the first syllable of *a*ha, *e* as in hate, *i* as *i* in machine, [or] *ee* in th*ee*, *o* as *o* in note, *u* as *oo* in food, or short as in bull, and the diphthong *ai* as *i* in wine or mine. The consonants are sounded as in English.
>
> The native words may be correctly pronounced by attending to the above sounds of the vowels: *Hawaii, Oahu, Tauai, Maui, Kearakekua, Kirauea, Mouna Roa, Mouna Kea, Tamehameha.*

Ellis states[32] that the alphabet used by Loomis in the printing of January 7 was indeed "that proposed by the Hon. John Pickering, of Salem, Mass." He comments further: "Every sound has its appropriate sign; every word is spelled exactly as it is pronounced."

Thus the problem of the vowels was settled. One matter, however, went by default, viz., vowel length. For Hawaiian affords numerous instances of vowels whose length is phonemic; i.e., the vowel length is the minimal significant difference which distinguishes the meaning of words which otherwise would be homonyms. More than forty years after Loomis and Ellis, W. D. Alexander[33] made a very clear explanation of this principle:

> It is important to observe the distinction between long and short vowels. Thus ăwa means a harbor, but āwa, a plant from which an intoxicating drink is made. Again kăua means war, while kāua means we two, or I and thou.

Other examples may be found, such as

kanaka [kɑ'nɑkə] (man)
kānaka [kɑ:'nɑkə] (men)

poho ['poho] (chalk)
pohō ['po'ho:] (to sink)[34]

No indication of phonemic length was ever incorporated into the Hawaiian alphabet. Even in modern Hawaiian, words affected by this principle must simply be memorized.

The coming of the printing press did not solve the problem of the consonants. Unresolved controversies remained over what is called in the missionaries' not always infallible English orthography "the interchangable [*sic*] sounds which were still puzzling and provoking all conserned [*sic*]." Today we can see that in some instances ultimately either an ambiguous symbol had to be chosen, as for [w-v], or certain allophones had to be stamped out, as for [k-t] and [l-r].

But the time was rapidly approaching when formal discussion, committee recommendations, and voting would lead toward the crystallization of Hawaiian orthography into its present state. A summary of the problems confronting the missionaries may make the subsequent account of their efforts toward solution easier to follow:

1. It was clear that pseudo-phonetic spelling using English language values for the Latin alphabet would never lend itself to uniformity and clarity. It had already been determined that, as to the vowels, the continental values were to be the solution.
2. Different people found themselves hearing Hawaiian consonants in dif-

[31] Ellis, p. 43.
[32] *Ibid.*, Preface, p. iv.
[33] W. D. Alexander, *A Short Synopsis of the Most Essential Points in Hawaiian: For the Use of the Pupils of Oahu College* (Honolulu, 1864), p. 4.
[34] It is evident that the stress shifts to take account of added length. A mark for irregular stress, as in Spanish, would have been a valuable addition.

ferent ways. Often the same person would hear the same Hawaiian speaker pronounce the same word with different consonants. When confronted with the two pronunciations, the Hawaiian would sometimes choose one rather than the other, or would say that both sounded alike to him and that it made no difference. Merely using Latin letters uniformly for all these sounds did not help. Something had to be done about the so-called interchangeable sounds, which were actually groups of allophones of single phonemes, each demanding to be represented by a single phonemic symbol. The following list of both the vowels and consonants, as they appear in modern Hawaiian, contains a partial indication of the problems of alternative speaking and hearing as of the 1820's.

In modern Hawaiian there are five vowel phonemes covering some nine phonetically distinguishable sounds, as follows:

VOWELS

Orthographic Symbols	Phonemes	Allophones
i	/i/	[i] ki [ki] (also, from the Tahitian, *ti*, a plant) [iɾ] wikiwiki ['wiɾki'wiɾki] (quickly)
e	/e/	[e] ke [ke] (the) 'oe ['ᵊoe] (you) [ɛ] Pele ['pɛlɛ] (the volcano goddess)
a	/ɑ/	[ɑ] ka [kɑ] (the) [ə] pehea [pe'heə] (how) [ʌ, ɑ] pali ['pʌli, pɑli] (cliff)
o	/o/	[o] koa [koə] (soldier)
u	/u/	[u] akua [ɑ'kuə] (God) aku ['ɑku] (bonito fish)

DIPHTHONGS

ai	/ɑi/[35]	[ʌi, ɑi] kai [kʌi, kɑi] (the sea, sea water)
au	/ɑu/[35]	[ʌu, ɑu] pau [pʌu, pɑu] (finished)
oi	/oi/	[oi] poi [poi] (kalo paste)
ei	/ei/	[ei] lei [lei] (garland)
eu	/eu/	[eu] keu [keu] (additional)
ou	/ou/	[ou] hou [hou] (new)

Hawaiian diphthongs appear to be spaced more widely than English diphthongs. Some, such as *ae, ao, oe,* are so widely spaced that it seems best to regard the vowels as being separate syllables.

[35] Helene Luise Newbrand, whose excellent unpublished M.A. thesis, "A Phonemic Analysis of Hawaiian" (University of Hawaii, 1951), based on the speech of nine native informants, has been a valuable check on numerous items in this article, finds /ɑi/ and /ɑu/ pronounced exclusively with the allophone [ʌ]; thus [ʌi] and [ʌu] (p. 11). However, [ɑi] and [ɑu] are frequently heard from Hawaiians who have learned their language in less isolated communities than did Newbrand's informants.

There are in modern Hawaiian eight consonant phonemes, covering some nine distinguishable sounds, as shown in the following list:

CONSONANTS

Orthographic Symbol	Phonemes	Allophones
h	/h/	[ɦ] hana ['ɦɑnə] (work)
k	/k/	[k] kolo ['kolo] (to crawl)
l	/l/	[l] loa [loə] (long)
m	/m/	[m] mō'ī [mo:ʔ'i:] (king)
n	/n/	[n] nei [nei] (here)
p	/p/	[p] pō [po:] (night)
w	/w/	[w] wahine [wɑ'hine] (woman)
		[v] hewa ['hɛvə] (error)
' or ʻ	/ʔ/	[ʔ] pa'u [pɑʔu] (soot)

The Hawaiian of 1820 had at least eleven distinguishable consonant sounds. Relative to these were many confusions, resulting (1) from the attempts on the part of the missionaries to set down sounds heard in rapid utterance; but more frequently and more puzzlingly (2) from the seemingly perverse allophones of some of the phonemes, as can be seen in the following:

Phonemes	Allophones	Example	Source	Normalized Spelling
/k/	[k]	kabu	Bishop	kapu (forbidden)
	[t]	tabu	Bishop	kapu
		Atooi	Cook, 1778	'o Kaua'i
		Tamaah Maah	Vancouver	Kamehameha
		Tamoree	Bingham, 1822	Kaumuali'i
		Terreeoboo	Bingham, 1822	Kalaniopu'u
	[d]	Kahow Modoo	Vancouver	Kalanimoku
/l/	[l]	Liholiho	Loomis	Liholiho (name)
	[r]	Rihoriho	Loomis	Liholiho
		Honoruru	Ellis	Honolulu
		Kairua	Ellis	Kailua (a town)
		harra	King	hale (house)
		Orono	King	'o Lono (a god)
	[d]	Hido	Chamberlain	Hilo (a city)
		lido	Chamberlain	lilo (to change)
/n/	[n]	nooie	Mrs. Holman	nui
	[r]	Orechoua	Cook, 1778	'o Niihoa
/p/	[p]	pule, pure	Ellis	pule (prayer)
	[b]	bule, bure	Ellis	pule
		Obookiah	Loomis	'Ōpūkaha'ia
		boa	Campbell	pua'a (pig)
		tabu	Ellis	kapu
/w/	[w]	Owhyhee	Cook, 1778	Hawai'i
	[v]	Havaii	Ellis, 1825	Hawai'i
		Waiava	Loomis, 1824	Waiawa (a valley)
		Halavr	Young, 1808	Halawa
/ʔ/	"breaks"	Ha-alilio	Bingham, 1822	Ha'alilio

The problems that ultimately assumed major importance in the minds of the missionaries were those posed by [k-t], [l-r], and [w-v]. These problems had to be solved, so that printing of hymns, lessons, and the Bible could be uniform. Of lesser importance in the minds of the missionaries were the problems of [p-b] and [l-d]. One minor problem, which appears to have solved itself even before the missionaries put their thought to matters of orthography, was [n-r]; [r] was tacitly dropped as an allophone of /n/.

One important problem, that of the glottal stop /ʔ/, though recognized by the missionaries,[36] was never subjected to proper formulation, and to this day has received no uniform recognition in Hawaiian orthography.

The missionaries, who undertook as early as 1821 to normalize Hawaiian orthography, and completed the normalization in 1826, knew nothing of what are now called phonemes and phoneme theory. No such book existed as Pike's recent work on the phoneme,[37] with its revealing subtitle, "A Technique for Reducing Languages to Writing."

The suggestion to use Latin vowel values was fortunate. Bingham, it will be remembered, had acknowledged the missionaries' debt to Pickering in 1822. "The basis of his [Pickering's] alphabet, in respect to vowel sounds, is followed."[38] Pickering had thus led them to a choice of vowel symbols which could hardly be improved upon, for these symbols agree almost point by point with those of modern IPA. But the "interchangable" consonants still plagued the missionaries. Some further explanation will clarify their thinking.

Problem Consonants

The Glottal Stop

The glottal stop is phonemic in Hawaiian. It constitutes, in any number of instances, the minimum of significant difference which changes the meaning of otherwise identically sounding words. For example: *kea* (white), *ke'a* (to hinder); *ia* (he, she, it), *i'a* (fish). Since the glottal stop is clearly a consonant, as meaningful and necessary as any other consonant in the language, the selection of a symbol for it was imperative. Possibly Cook was groping for a symbol when he inserted the *h* in *Owhyhee*, but neither he nor anyone after him pursued the idea consistently. Bingham makes a useful observation:

> Double or triple vowels are never used to express a single sound, and where they occur, are sounded separately, as: a-a, e-e, i-i, o-o, u-u. The accent being generally on the former, the latter being a sort of echo, as in the name Ha-a-li-li-o.[39]

Obviously Bingham recognized the glottal stop acoustically, but he speaks of it only as separating adjacent identical vowels. The idea that the separation was often meaningful, that is, phonemic, seems not to have occurred to him. It should have occurred to Ellis, since he had traveled among the Polynesian Islands considerably and must have encountered words still retaining the /k/ of which the Hawaiian glottal stop appears to be vestigial.

Compare the following:

Maori *karihi*	(weights on lines)
Tahitian *'arihi*	(fish net lines)
Hawaiian *'alihi*	(rope for weights)
Maori *ariki*	(king, chief)
Tuamotu *ariki*	" "
Samoan *ali'i*	" "
Hawaiian *ali'i*	" "

[36] Hiram Bingham, *The Sandwich Islands* (Hartford, Huntington, 1847), p. 162. Bingham remarks in 1822, "There are . . . abrupt separations or short and sudden breaks between two vowels in the same word."

[37] Kenneth L. Pike, *Phonemics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1947).

[38] Bingham, p. 155.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 154.

Since the etymology shows the sound to have been *k* originally, Ellis should have recognized the glottal stop as a consonant in full standing, and provided a symbol for it. But this desirable end has never been achieved, except irregularly in modern dictionaries and teaching materials. Books in Hawaiian, such as the Bible; Fornander's[40] excellent collection of legends, chants, etc.; and the once plentiful Hawaiian language newspapers, show no symbol for the glottal stop.

[k-t]

The Hawaiian of the period between 1778 and 1826 had three plosives: the glottal stop, the bilabial [p] (with alternative [b]), and a roof-of-the-mouth plosive [k-t], for which the tongue contact might be anywhere between the teeth and the soft palate. Since the Hawaiian ear required only that this plosive distinguish itself from [p] and the glottal stop, it mattered not at all where the closure was made.[41]

The occasional spelling of this sound with *d*, as in Vancouver's *Kahow Modoo* for *Kalanimoku*, is a record of a voiced form of the [t]. Voicing was a freely variant feature. Apparently it did not appear often; no attention is given to it in the deliberations of the missionaries. So far as it constituted a problem, it seems to have solved itself.

[l-r-d]

The sounds *l* and *r* (trilled), and less frequently *d*, belonged to the same phoneme, as is familiar from the well-known substitution of *l* for *r* in English by the Chinese and others. Hawaiian examples: *Liholiho—Rihoriho*, *Hido—Hilo*. It is clear that a tapped or briefly trilled *r* and a dental *d* have much in common with [l], viz., voicing and tongue-tip contact, as well as acoustic effect.

[p-b]

The confusion of [p] and [b], as in *pule-bule*, is easily understood as a matter of non-significant voicing. This [b] seems to have died out without much attention.

[w-v]

The problem of [w] and [v] does not appear to parallel exactly those of [k-t] and [l-r]. As will be seen, the missionaries do not make clear what, precisely, the problem was in their time. They mention the interchangeability of [w] and [v],[42] but they do not state specifically that these sounds are uniformly interchangeable; and, quite understandably, they do not discover that the true Hawaiian [v]-sound is seldom or never the tense [v], but instead the lax [ʋ].[43] The sounds are certainly not freely interchangeable in modern Hawaiian. There appear, rather, to be two "dialects" of Hawaiian, in one of which *w* is pronounced [w] throughout, while in the other *w* is pronounced [w] when preceded by *o* or *u*, and [ʋ] in all other instances,[44] thus *wahine* [ʋɑ'hine] (woman), but *'o wahine* [ʔo wɑ'hine]. The influence of a rounded vowel in producing a succeeding [w] is evident.

[40] Abraham Fornander, *Fornander's Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-lore* (Honolulu: H. I. Bishop Museum Press, 1916-17).

[41] Newbrand's research shows that [t] still exists as an allophone of /k/ in Niihau, the most isolated of the Hawaiian Islands.

[42] "Journal of the Mission" in the *Missionary Herald*, (February 1823). Also unpublished minutes of the Prudential Meetings of the Mission (written by Levi Chamberlain) June 20, 1825. Original in Archives of Hawaiian Board, Hawaiian Mission Children's Library, Honolulu. Also Ellis, p. 243.

[43] Possibly in some instances the bilabial voiced fricative [β].

[44] This is the opinion of Samuel H. Elbert, Department of Pacific Languages, University of Hawaii, Honolulu. Letter to C. M. Wise, September 11, 1951. Newbrand, *op. cit.*, pp. 128-131, finds evidence to the same effect.

Vowels

[e-ɛ]

The missionaries do not mention difficulties with the allophones of the vowel phonemes. Possibly, in their times, there were few allophones of the basic /i/, /e/, /ɑ/, /o/, /u/. There are relatively few in present day Hawaiian. The letter *e*, for example, is in by far the largest number of cases pronounced [e], as in *eha* ['ehɑ] (pain). But in a limited number of words, prominently where *e* is adjacent to *l*, *n*, or *w*, the pronunciation is nowadays [ɛ]. Examples: *hele* ['hɛlɛ] (to walk), *mele* ['mɛlɛ] (song), *Ewa* ['ɛvə], *lewa* ['lɛvə], *Pele* ['pɛlɛ] (volcano goddess), *lele* ['lɛlɛ] (to jump), *hewa* ['hɛvə], *kenikeni* ['kɛni'kɛni] (ten cents).

[ɑ-ə-ʌ]

The phoneme [ɑ] from the earliest missionary times contained the allophone [ə] regularly in unstressed syllables, as in *kaha* ['kɑhə] (to draw), *mea* ['meə] (thing), *akea* [ɑ'keə] (broad, open). In stressed syllables, the allophone [ʌ] appeared in non-significant variation with [ɑ], as in [45]['pʌli] for *pali* (cliff), ['mʌke] for *make* (dead), ['pʌlə'pʌlə] for *palapala* (writing). That this variant was common is evident from the fact that Campbell[45] wrote "u, as in the word 'but,'" and that Lucia Holman in her journal[46] wrote *pulla-pulla* for *palapala*.

[i-iɪ]

In modern Hawaiian, the phoneme [i] has an allophone [iɪ], which occurs in a very limited number of words, such as *wikiwiki* ['wiɪki'wiɪki] (quickly) and *like* ['liɪke] (like). Campbell[47] mentions "'I', as in the word 'indolence.'" Here he clearly intended [ɪ]. But his writing *wikiwiki* as *weete weete* indicates that, as he heard it, this word was pronounced ['witi'witi].

—o—

The remainder of this account, consisting mainly of a series of extracts from minutes of meetings and from letters, illustrates the processes of thought through which the missionaries progressed from the hit-and-miss pseudophonetics of their early spelling to an orderly and almost perfectly functional phonemic spelling, as illustrated throughout the foregoing. These data will be presented in two divisions: (1) the earlier gropings toward uniform orthographics (1821-25); and (2) the formal deliberations, correspondence, and voting (1825-26).[48]

1821-1825

Hiram Bingham, the leader of the original group of seven missionaries, was no mean thinker. His grasp of the problems of setting up an alphabet was strikingly complete. Surprisingly enough, he considered also a syllabary (which would have been a distinct possibility), though he presumably knew no Japanese or other language using one. Writing in 1840, he explained the procedures of 1822:

> To avoid all arbitrary spelling, all silent letters and the representation of the same monosound by several different letters, and many sounds by the same letter, as in the English, seemed to be due . . . to the . . . Hawaiians. It was, therefore, a part of our task to secure to the people a perfect alphabet, literal or syllabic, of all the sounds which were then in use. . . . Had we made . . . a single vowel stand for as many sounds as in English, and several different vowels for the same sound, and given the consonants the ambiguity of our c, s, t, ch,

[45] Archibald Campbell, "A Vocabulary of the Language of the Sandwich Islands," in *Voyage Around the World* (Edinburgh: 1816), pp. 227-255.

[46] Lucia Holman, pp. 18 ff.

[47] Campbell, *loc. cit.*

[48] Most of the source material for the quotations following has been furnished by the Hawaiian Mission Children's Library, Honolulu, through the kindness of the librarian, Miss Bernice Judd.

gh, etc., it would have been extremely difficult if not impracticable to induce the nation to become readers. . . .

There were some difficulties to be encountered in distinguishing several consonant sounds, and to determine which of two characters in the Roman or English alphabet to adopt for certain sounds that appeared somewhat variable in the mouths of the natives. The following appeared sometimes to be interchangable [*sic*]: b and p, k and t, l and r, v and w, and even the sound of d, it was thought by some, was used in some cases where others used k, l, r, or t.[49]

The problems posed by Bingham had become acute in 1822 when Loomis, the printer, finally put into action the little hand-operated "Ramage" printing press which the missionaries had brought with them in 1820. Bingham continues:

When the king [Liholiho] first examined the press, a sheet of white paper being laid on, he pulled the lever round and was surprised to see the paper instantly covered with words in his own language. . . . Being once asked whether L or R ought to be used in the spelling of his name, he attempted earnestly to ring the changes on the two letters, and at length gave the preference to R and used it, though L is doubtless the better representative of the initial sound in his name.[50]

An entry in the "Journal of the Mission" for January 1, 1822, shows a praiseworthy effort on the part of the missionary group to learn what was being done about the orthography of other dialects of Polynesian, in this case Maori. We have seen how the group procured and at once made use of *The New Zealand Grammar and Vocabulary*. The journal entry of July 6, 1822, contains a copy of a joint letter looking toward a junket to the Society Islands in search of information on orthography:

By the last conveyance [the ship *Arab*] . . . we . . . gave you some intimation of a contemplated visit to the Society Islands, by the special and gratuitous favor of king Tamoree . . . [in] one of his fine new brigs. . . . We desire . . . to obtain copies of all their [the Tahitians'] elementary books, [and] translations, and . . . to consult them especially respecting the most convenient characters for writing and printing this language . . .

William Ellis had arrived from Tahiti just three months earlier. Four major events in the history of Hawaiian orthography were thus crowded into the first six months of 1822:

January 1, The arrival of the *New Zealand Grammar and Vocabulary*.
January 7, The first printing.
April 7, The arrival of Ellis in the Islands.
July 6, The announcement of the junket to Tahiti.

Obviously each of these events greatly affected the situation. So did the writings of Pickering,[51] which Bingham[52] mentions in his book just one page before the account of the first printing. Pickering and *The New Zealand Grammar and Vocabulary* had influenced the missionaries to write vowels in the Latin style, and Ellis' arrival confirmed them in that practice.

As seen on p. 317, Ellis still used *t*, *r*, and *b*. As late as 1824, Loomis wrote in his "Journal"[53] *Tamehameha, Tauai, Honoruru, Rihoriho, Waititi*, etc. Both he and Ellis, however, used *k* in some words, and Loomis admits specifically (June 22, 1824) that

The L and R and the K and T are according to the opinions of some, used interchangably [*sic*] by the natives—certainly they are so used by some of the members of the Mission. Thus Kairua may be spelt Kairua or Kailua, Tairua or Tailua.

1825-26

The move toward the solution of the problem of the consonants was not long in coming. The minutes[54] of the Pru-

[49] Bingham, pp. 152-155.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 156.
[51] Pickering, *op. cit.*
[52] Bingham, p. 155.
[53] Elisha Loomis, "Journal," 1824-1826, original in Library of the University of Hawaii.
[54] "Unpublished Minutes of the Prudential Meetings of the Mission," in Archives, Hawaiian Mission Children's Library, Honolulu, pp. 1-2.

dential Meeting of the Mission in Honolulu, May 17, 1825, Bingham, Stewart, Ely, Loomis, Chamberlain, and Blatchely present, tell their own story.

The committee on arrangements proposed the following question for consideration. "Is uniformity in the Hawaiian language expedient? and what are the best means of securing it?" Upon this question the following order was taken. . . . Resolved: That a committee of three be appointed to correspond with the different members of the Mission as to the expediency of establishing an uniformity in the orthography of the Hawaiian language, and to submit to this meeting for their consideration propositions embracing the difficulties now felt in spelling the language. For this Committee made choice of Messrs. H. Bingham, C. S. Stewart, Levi Chamberlain.[55]

On June 20, 1825, the committee reported:

The Committee appointed to correspond with the different members of the Mission respecting the expediency of an uniformity in the orthography of the Hawaiian language submitted the following view of the subject which was approved.

The Committee . . . beg leave to submit the following propositions embracing as they conceive the difficulties now felt in spelling the language.

An Alphabet was adopted more than three years ago; which was intended to include all the letters necessary and no more.

It has been found however from careful attention, that b and d, though they are used by a few natives in a certain class of words, may always with strict propriety be supplied by others, which better represent the sound most frequently heard in the pronunciation of those words. K and t, l and r, v and w, are used interchangably [*sic*]. Some individuals used the k in the same word in which t is more uniformly employed by others. The same difference exists in reference to the other four letters.

In order to effect an uniformity either the k or the t, the l or the r, the v or the w must be excluded from the Hawaiian Alphabet.

1. Shall *b* and *d* be retained in the Hawaiian Alphabet, or shall they be regarded as foreign letters, and be only used in spelling foreign words?
2. Shall *k* be excluded or shall *t*, or shall both be retained?
3. Shall *l* be excluded or shall *r*, or shall both be retained?
4. Shall *v* be excluded or shall *w*, or shall both be retained?

Many words at present, in which *r* occurs, are, by many uniformly pronounced as if written with *l*; and the same is true with respect to the *k* and *t*, and the *v* and *w*.

The inconvenience attending the present method of spelling is obvious, and is felt by every member of the Mission. Honoruru may be written four different ways, and is constantly written two ways. Kaavaroa may be written eight, and is actually written three. Kealakekua may be written sixteen, and is uniformly written three or four, and every word in the language, in which letters occur that are used interchangably [*sic*], may, by permutation, be written nearly as many different ways as the square of the whole number of interchangable [*sic*] letters in the word . . .

Levi Chamberlain Secy.
H. Bingham Moderator[56]

When the committee on orthography corresponded with the members of the mission concerning the specific details of the consonants they received a number of helpful letters.[57] Abraham Blatchely, a physician, wrote (July 11, 1826) with a heavy attempt at wit in a style loaded with medical nomenclature.

Having been consulted upon the case of the *orthography* of the Hawaiian language I beg leave to state that I consider the present state in which it lies to be a diseased one and that as the disease has already become chronic something ought to be administered or some course of treatment adopted immediately to remove it . . . I find as a *proximate* cause five separate extraneous or foreign substances in the Alphabet (viz)

1st one called in the English language a *Be*
2nd " - - - - - do - - - a *De*
3rd " - - - - - do - - - an *Ef*

[55] *Loc. cit.*

[56] *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

[57] The originals of all these letters are on file at the Hawaiian Mission Children's Library, Honolulu.

4th one call'd in the English language a *Te*
& 5th "- - - - - do - - - a *Ve*

These cannot remain without producing a constant morbid invitation . . .

Would not an Emetic to remove the two uppermost & this followed by a Cathartic to discharge the other three be as good as any? . . .

Levi Chamberlain wrote (July 14, 1826) in all seriousness, but with slightly divided mind.

I have found my mind at times in doubt respecting the propriety of rejecting characters expressing sounds which to my ear are daily articulated by the natives, and which I have the evidence of my *auditory faculties* are in the language.

But reflection upon the subject has convinced me, that confusion in the language will be perpetuated by an *indiscriminate* use of the interchangable [*sic*] letters; . . . because of the indiscriminate manner in which the natives themselves employ the sounds in question . . .

. . . My mind has been determined to uniformity in favor of rejecting one class of the interchangable [*sic*] letters and of the two doubtful characters Viz. B & D.

It is my wish therefore that the Hawaiian alphabet should consist only of the following characters.—

A, E, I, O, U, H, K, L, M, N, P, W.

James Ely was brief and to the point:

As my opinion is requested respecting the use of b, d, r, t, & v, l, k, & w in writing the Hawaiian language I would give it as follows.

Reject b, d, r, t, v.

providing that they be used in spelling foreign words.

Joseph Goodrich wrote from Hilo, Island of Hawaii, under date of April 3, 1826.

You request my opinion respecting uniformity in spelling the Hawaiian language.

1. Respecting b & d, —b I should say at once might be omitted, for I have no use for it here. The sound of d I distinctly hear in a few words, such as lido, maraida &c—I am ready to drop it, or retain it, just as you please however.

2. Respecting k & t—I have no use for t in this place. I should say therefore exclude it.

3. L & r,—speaking of Hilo nei still,—I should exclude the l.

4. As to v & w it is a matter of indifference to me which is excluded,—one answers all the purposes of both.

William Richards wrote a long letter, part of which appears here. His reference to Ellis emphasizes the importance of Ellis' influence on the thinking of the group.

The word *Tu* may be written *Ku* and of course may be pronounced either way. . . .

I believe it is very generally agreed that there is a peculiar sound which is something like a medium between the English *l* & *r*. I think too, it is generally agreed that the natives do differ among themselves in the articulation of this medium sound; and that some approach nearer to the *l* or *r* than others. But if the natives do differ among themselves, or if the sound is neither *l* nor *r*, but a medium between the two or if the people are unable to distinguish between the sounds of the letters, then what I said respecting t & k will apply here; . . .

Simplicity is unquestionably one desirable object to be aimed at in establishing the orthography of a language. I am therefore of opinion that only one letter should be retained in each class of interchangables [*sic*]; and would drop B. D, R. T. V. and only use them in spelling foreign words.

. . .

Were Mr. Ellis present, I should certainly prize and pay great deference to his opinion. . . . I also feel sure that, if a handsome majority of this mission, decide on a particular course, Mr. E will not on his return adopt a plan which shall clash with our proceedings . . .

Asa Thurston wrote (April 5, 1826), probably jokingly, from Kailua, Island of Hawaii:

The following is the number of consonants found in an old manuscript, designed, as it appears from the document, to have completed the Hawaiian Alphabet in conjunction with the five vowels. viz. h. k. l. m. n. p. w.

I find that these are exactly the number which I have always used in writing the language . . . In my opinion the b & d have no business in the Alphabet. He mea maikai paha e i aku ia laua la, e hele olua pela, he mau mea ino, he mau mea i kolohe mai ai. [Free translation of the Hawaiian: It is well perhaps

to discard those two. They are unnecessary & they may cause us trouble hereafter.]

In the second place the k & the t though they are both used, still I should prefer one to both on the ground of simplicity. It is my wish to strike out the t.

In the third place I should retain the l & reject the r .....[paper torn] .....

In the fourth place the v & w. Though the v may be used by some few natives whose upper lips are too short, & whose fore teeth are very prominent; yet I question whether the proper sound of the v is found in the language. . . . Therefore I should say, e hele pela ae, e ka v nei, he ino loa ka kino pau pu me ko naau. Ae aloha wale [hole in the paper] e ka w la. [Free translation of the Hawaiian: Therefore I should say let us make this decision concerning the v, it is no good at all, it should be completely abandoned. I am strongly in favor of the w.]

Perhaps the climax of all these letters is that of Elisha Loomis, who wrote in Hawaiian, arbitrarily (and wittily) making all the variations and interchangings possible with the disputed letters. His effort must have been more convincing than some of the much more lengthy communications.

Na
Mita Pinamutane, me
Mita Temenena,
Honoluru nei

Tuvaiahao, Oahu
Jurai 5, 1826

Aroha olua

Te hai atu nei vau ia orua i tuu vahi manao no ta hua o ka Barapala o Havaii nei. Ua tari nui vau i ka rohe ana i ta palabara o ta boe Mitaneri mai Havaii a Kauvai, no ta mea i aluaru vau i ta boe itaikao ratou. maraida vau. Hootahi makemate vau, no ka mea i ta hooborolei takou i ta katou barabala, ne ta hooharite. Eia tahi manao i hootomoia i roto kuu obu a buka atu i tuu vahi vaha. I huarele katou teia mau hua B.D.R.T.V.

E malama takou ta A.E.I.O.U.H.K.L.M.N.P.W.

I na e hoobolorei vauee katou i ta takou palabara i na ua orioli vau. Ta olua tauva haha

Raumiti

[Free translation by A. F. Judd and P. H. Buck]

Kawaihao, Oahu
July 5, 1826

My love to you two,

I am sending you my humble thought concerning the form of writing in Hawaii. I have considered a long time the written language of the Missionary group from Hawaii to Kauai because I concur with the majority of them. That's where I stand. I wish one thing greatly that we should all study our writing and make it uniform. Here is one idea that has entered my mind and comes out through my mouth. Let us abandon these letters [forms] B. D. R. T. V.

We are clear about A. E. I. O. U. H. K. L. M. N. P. W.

Thus I have put us right concerning our writing and now I am happy.

Your obedient servant,
Laumiki (Loomis)

Along with the foregoing letters, the Committee submitted (July 14, 1826) a memorandum on those who had not answered the request for an opinion.

With respect to the orthography Mr. Whitney in a letter to Mr. Bingham remarks "You know my partiality for the R & W. but I shall contend for neither. I leave it to the judgment of the Committee. I pledge myself to abide by their decision.

Mr. Ruggles has returned no answer.

Mr. Bingham has returned no answer.

Mr. Ellis is regarded as in favor of all the letters.

Mr. Stewart (as stated by Mr. Bingham) as holding the opinion that none of the characters can be cast out without rendering the alphabet defective.

In the end the committee collected some nine votes, registering remarkable agreement. A letter dated at Lahaina, Maui, August 5, 1826, contains an extract of the circular sent to all the missionary stations by Messrs. Bingham, Stewart, and Chamberlain, and a list of the votes thus:

Votes for Striking Out

B	9 votes	P	none
D	8 votes	L	2 votes
K	0	T	8 votes
V	9 votes	W	0
	R 6 votes		

This eliminated *b, d, v, r,* and *t,* and retained *k, p, l, w,* which now could be placed with *m, n, h,* about which there had never been any question. This would have been the ideal time to add symbols for the glottal stop and for phonemic length; that such symbols were not included is regrettable.

But the missionaries were not phonemicists, nor linguists of any sort except in a practical, self-taught manner. The only help they had came from another practical linguist, Ellis, and from the more contemplative Pickering, behind whom stood the philosophical Duponceau. It must be said with no more than a minimum of reservation that they did astonishingly well. Anyone who has occasion to experience the relative ease of reading or writing Hawaiian will testify that, without ever having heard of phonemics, the missionaries nevertheless applied its principles with remarkable success to the devising of an alphabet for a language that had none.

COMMENTARIES

THE BASIC SKILL

Most of you graduating today will be employees all your working life. . . .

. . . . . .

The first question we might ask is: what can you learn in college that will help you in being an employee? The schools teach a great many things of value to the future accountant, the future doctor, or the future electrician. Do they also teach anything of value to the future employee? The answer is: "Yes—they teach the one thing that it is perhaps most valuable for the future employee to know. But very few students bother to learn it."

This one basic skill is the ability to organize and express ideas in writing and in speaking.

. . . . . .

. . . as soon as you move one step up from the bottom, your effectiveness depends on your ability to reach others through the spoken or the written word. And the further away your job is from manual work, the larger the organization of which you are an employee, the more important it will be that you know how to convey your thoughts in writing or speaking. In the very large organization, whether it is the government, the large business corporation, or the Army, this ability to express oneself is perhaps the most important of all the skills a man can possess.

Of course, skill in expression is not enough by itself. You must have something to say in the first place. . . .

. . . . . .

Expressing one's thoughts is one skill that the school can really teach, especially to people born without natural writing or speaking talent. Many other skills can be learned later—in this country there are literally thousands of places that offer training to adult people at work. But the foundations for skill in expression have to be laid early: an interest in and an ear for language; experience in organizing ideas and data, in brushing aside the irrelevant, in wedding outward form and inner content into one structure; and above all the habit of verbal expression. If you do not lay these foundations during your school years, you may never have an opportunity again.—Peter F. Drucker, "How to Be an Employee," *Fortune*, XLV, 5 (May 1952), 126-127. Reprinted by permission.

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF SPEECH FRIGHT

Floyd I. Greenleaf

EXPERIMENTAL evidence bearing specifically on the problem of "stage fright" is not abundant. Most of the studies reported deal chiefly with the physiological aspects of the problem. Lomas'[1] summary of relevant findings and assumptions may be paraphrased as follows:

> The experimental findings pertinent to the problem of stage fright are summarized under five generalizations: (1) the physiological picture differs little in fear, rage, excitement, or vigorous physical action; (2) adrenalin alone, or adrenalin and thyroxin together, while they may produce all of the physiological changes common in emotion, do not produce the conscious states known to emotion except in rare instances; (3) the physiological changes produced in the body at critical moments are of such a nature to contribute to the efficient use of the muscles, to cause an increase in the available energy, and to protect the body against loss of blood; (4) the organization of emotional responses takes place on a subcortical level, probably in the thalamus; (5) the degree of integration of behavior under emotional stimulation varies widely. The general findings regarding emotion are held to support the view that 'stage fright does not differ in chemical or visceral components from the strong emotions characteristic of vigorous and effective speech.' Specific evidence is found 'in the common knowledge that public speech inhibits the digestive processes, a known function of adrenalin.' The unpleasant quality of stage fright is considered a function of disorganization and lack of cortical control of the vigorous activity aroused by the situation.

With respect to the percentage of the population experiencing stage fright, Knower[2] has reported that 56 per cent of one group of 210 University of Minnesota students and 61 per cent of another similar group of 277 students listed some form of nervousness as one of their speech problems. In a group of 512 high school students of speech, rated by eight speech instructors, only 29 per cent were judged to be free from some form of emotional difficulty in speaking situations. Seventy-four per cent of these high school students judged themselves on a three-point nervousness scale to to be at least somewhat nervous when speaking.

This study is designed as an exploratory investigation of stage fright—or, preferably, social speech fright. Two general methods were followed: a preliminary survey of 384 students followed by interviews with fourteen individuals professing to experience severe speech fright, and a situational speech inventory in the form of a questionnaire administered to 789 students in the course in Communication Skills at the State University of Iowa.

II

Preliminary Survey

A preliminary survey was made chiefly to give an indication of the distribution of the population in terms of degrees of speech fright. This survey also provided subjects for the interviews.

Students in Communication Skills classes were asked to evaluate themselves with reference to speech fright on a four-point scale ranging from no speech fright to severe speech fright. Results are given in Table I.

Floyd Greenleaf (M.A., Iowa, 1947) is an Instructor of Speech in the Speech and Hearing Clinic at San Jose State College.

[1] C. W. Lomas, "The Psychology of Stage Fright," *QJS*, XXIII (1937), 35-44.

[2] F. H. Knower, "A Study of Speech Attitudes and Adjustments," *Speech Monographs*, V (1938), 130-203.

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF SELF RATINGS OF DEGREE OF SPEECH FRIGHT BY 384 COMMUNICATION SKILLS STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA.

Degree of speech fright	Male N-305 Percentage	Female N-79 Percentage	Total N-384 Percentage
None	18	6	16
Mild	31	41	33
Moderate	45	43	45
Severe	6	10	6

Interviews

Fourteen individuals who had indicated that they had "severe speech fright" on the survey questionnaire were interviewed, each for about one hour. Analysis of the interviews divided itself into four general areas: onset, symptoms, avoidance tendencies, and expressions of the need for assistance with the problem. It should be pointed out that interviews of fourteen individuals professing to experience speech fright can be expected to produce only indications of possible trends. The interviews were designed primarily to provide leads for the construction of the questionnaire to be administered to several hundred students. The findings are of sufficient interest in their own right to warrant brief summarization.

A variety of symptoms was described but most of the individuals agreed in reporting anticipatory reactions of worry, tension, and avoidance tendencies. The majority reported the pre-speaking period to be quite disturbing. Anticipation ranged from feelings of tension experienced weeks in advance of the event to apprehensions felt in walking to the speaker's platform. The anticipatory period was characterized by a "general feeling of alarm," confusion, inability to organize the speech, worry, and anticipation of unpleasantness. Some individuals said they even experienced a sort of rehearsal of their symptoms many hours in advance of the actual speaking situation.

Individuals experiencing speech fright seem to have considerable fear that they will be unable to speak, will become inarticulate, lose their voices or control of their voices, that they will not be able to get their ideas across, that they will become confused and not make sense.

Most cases reported experiencing one or more of the following while speaking: tension in the abdominal region, tremors of the extremities, acceleration of the heart rate, dryness of the mouth or throat, excessive perspiration, difficulty in breathing, unusual pitch characteristics, "stomach upset," coldness of the extremities, weakness of voice, inability to look at the audience, forgetting, confusion of ideas, feeling that the audience is disapproving, desire to be out of the situation. This desire to leave is occasionally so strong that the speaker does not finish the speech. Apparently considerable apprehension also centers around possible aphonia or loss of control of the voice.

Post-speaking symptoms appear to be chiefly physical fatigue and feelings of relief.

Statements by the subjects concerning their first experiences of speech fright were for the most part vague. Most individuals seem to have difficulty recalling not having had speech fright. Most of the subjects could recall one or more unpleasant experiences in audience situations in early life. During the interviews some of the subjects seemed

to consider for the first time the possible connection between these incidents and their present speech fright. The incidents were usually reported in some detail. There seems to be considerable indication that something in the school environment contributed markedly to the development of the early fears and tensions. Authoritative criticism and disapproval and reactions to them apparently partly determined the degree of speech fright and the types of situations in which it is experienced.

Two cases who reported recent development of speech fright were considerably older than most of the freshman or sophomore students with whom they were associated in class. One, a man 34 years old, did not experience speech fright to any appreciable degree until he entered college after being discharged from the armed services. This individual had had considerable speaking experience, including addresses to P.T.A. groups, young people's groups, large bodies of men in the army, and radio broadcasting. Strangely enough, he reported that he experienced speech fright only in his speech class, in which he seemed especially conscious of his age in comparison to the other students. He stated that he would experience speech fright in class, and yet on the same day he could do a radio broadcast and experience no discomfort. The other case of this type was a 27-year-old woman who presented a history of development similar to that of the 34-year-old man described above. She also had had considerable speaking experience. She reported having no speech fright until she started speaking in the class she was in when interviewed, where most of the students were younger.

One unusual case reported being embarrassed because both of his parents were blind. He stated that he preferred not being seen in public with them because he felt conspicuous. The parents were apparently quite capable in spite of their disability. The mother once appeared at the boy's school and spoke in assembly; this was a most vividly embarrassing experience for him. His embarrassment apparently reached its height when, after his mother had completed an apparently successful speech, his classmates crowded around him to congratulate him on his mother's performance.

It is interesting and perhaps significant to note that in practically every case the speech fright and the related embarrassing audience situations reported by the subjects had occurred in school.

The effect of speech fright on the social and economic life of the individual is apparently considerable. Most of the subjects interviewed were impressed by the limitations their speech fright imposed upon them. The extent to which this condition seemed to affect their social and economic life varied considerably with each individual, but practically all the subjects mentioned occasions when they failed to do things they wanted to do because of their speech fright. Several stated that they were purposely preparing themselves for positions which would require practically no contact with people. In nearly every case, the interviewer could trace an increasing number of activities which had been closed to the individual by his fears and related evaluations, as his speech fright had developed over a period of years.

Deep concern over the problem was apparent in most of the subjects interviewed. Many expressed bewilderment over why they were afflicted with this demoralizing handicap. Most of the students, as the interview progressed, talked more or less freely about the

problem and seemed eager to learn all they could about causes and possibilities of retraining. They expressed concern over the fact that, so far as they knew, apparently no one could help them. Common, and even very reputable, sources of help had not proved fruitful in some cases. For example, one student said, "I went to a psychologist and he said he couldn't do anything for me." Another said, "I was told that I needed more experience in public speaking, so enrolled in a course in debate and a course in discussion. It was torture and my stage fright is no better." With one exception, the individuals felt they would like to enroll in a special class designed to help them work on the problem of stage fright. These affirmative responses were made in spite of the careful emphasis placed on the voluntary, non-credit character of such a possible class. One of the students interviewed requested a second interview, and another made two special trips to see the writer to ask about the possibility of starting a class in the immediate future.

III

As a result of the interviews, a questionnaire was developed and administered to 789 Communication Skills students of freshman and sophomore classifications. The nature of the questionnaire is implied by the character of the findings obtained.

Data like those presented in Table I for the 384 students reached in the preliminary survey are given in Table II for the 789 students who answered the questionnaire.

Like Table I, Table II indicates that according to their own evaluations comparatively few students experience no speech fright. More than half experience a moderate or severe degree of speech fright, as self-rated. No marked sex difference appears.

The 789 students were divided into four groups according to the self-ratings: *none, mild, moderate, severe.* Random samples of 50 individuals were then drawn from each of the four groups. The following findings were obtained from these samples of 50 students from each group, a total of 200.

Number of symptoms reported. The following symptoms were reported:

1. Dryness of throat or mouth
2. Forgetting
3. Tension in the abdominal region
4. Inability to produce voice
5. Stuttering or stammering
6. Tremors of knees and hands
7. Weak voice
8. Excessive perspiration
9. Accelerated heart rate
10. Speech rate too fast or too slow
11. Stomach upset
12. Difficulty in breathing
13. Inability to look at audience
14. Feeling that the audience is disapproving
15. Inability to finish speaking
16. Excessive hesitation
17. Dread before speaking

The rank order of the symptoms according to the frequency of occurrence is essentially the same for all groups. Moreover, all groups tended to rank the difficulty of various speech sit-

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF SELF-RATINGS OF DEGREE OF SPEECH FRIGHT BY 789 COMMUNICATION SKILLS STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA.

Degree of speech fright	Male N-664 Percentage	Female N-125 Percentage	Total N-789 Percentage
None	11	12	11
Mild	32	27	32
Moderate	47	51	47
Severe	10	10	10

uations similarly. The number of symptoms reported increased, however, in the progression from no speech fright to severe speech fright. Considerable individual differences appeared in all groups. The data were analyzed in an attempt to determine the chief differences between the group with no speech fright and the severe speech fright group. Every symptom was reported more freqently by the severe group. Symptoms 15, 7, 13, 6, 14, 5, 4, and 8, as numbered in the list above, were differentiated most clearly.

IV

This study of social speech fright involved a preliminary survey of 384 Communication Skills students, interviews with fourteen students professing to experience severe speech fright, and the administration of a questionnaire based on these interviews to 789 Communication Skills students.

Symptoms of speech fright appear to fall into three general classifications: evaluational, such as "feeling that the audience is disapproving of you"; physiological, such as "stomach upset"; and avoidance tendencies, such as "desire to escape from the situation."

In terms of onset, speech fright appears to be of two general types. The first, and apparently more common, type seems to involve a gradual development of fears and tensions in speech situations beginning early in life. There appears to be a strong indication that school experiences contribute considerably toward the development of these fears and tensions. The second type begins relatively late in life and develops more or less suddenly in individuals who have apparently not been troubled previously with speech fright. In these cases, as observed in this study, the individual finds himself in a situation where his associates are considerably younger than he and where his own status seems nevertheless to be the same as theirs.

A relationship seems to exist between the degree of speech fright and the tendency to avoid speech situations. There is an indication that speech fright tends to restrict the individual's social and vocational activities.

The more severe the speech fright, as self-rated, the more numerous the symptoms reported. The important appear to be these:

1. Inability to finish speaking
2. Weak voice
3. Inability to look at audience
4. Tremors of knees, hands, etc.
5. Feeling that the audience is disapproving
6. Inability to produce voice
7. Excessive perspiration

The similarities and differences between speech fright and stuttering could probably be investigated to advantage. It seems not unlikely that considerable advance in the understanding of the problem could be made if some of the investigative approaches to stuttering were to be adapted to the study of speech fright. It is possible, too, that the techniques of re-education that will eventually find favor among those dealing with speech fright may be similar to some of the more recent developments in the treatment of stuttering.[3] In both conditions the basic disturbance may be designated as anxiety-tension occasioned by misevaluative reactions to speech situations. One of the reasons for importance of the apparent similarity of the two disorders, if it can be established, is that it would indicate the possibility of bringing directly to bear on the speech fright problem the relatively well developed body of theory, experimental technology, and clinical method developed through recent scientific study of stuttering.

[3] Wendell Johnson, *et al.*, *Speech Handicapped School Children* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948).

THE GILMAN PLAN FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA: A SYMPOSIUM

Paul D. Bagwell

DURING the past few years various members of our Association have expressed dissatisfaction concerning what they have termed separatist movements and the growth of specialisms within the Speech Association of America. These persons see going on within the Association a splitting up, a splintering, and a fragmenting which they believe to threaten its future growth and welfare. Some of these same persons and others have expressed a desire for changes in the structure and form of government of our national Association. Of such expressions some have appeared in the *Journal;* others have occurred in private conversations, letters, committee meetings, and public addresses.

These statements have usually been based upon a desire to diminish the opportunities for the growth of specialisms *or* to recognize that such specialisms exist and thereby provide machinery to enable independent autonomous organizations to cooperate with the Speech Association as full partners, constituent members, or departments. Others desire a change in the structure and government of the Association to diminish the opportunities for the dominance of one group of "specialists" or "generalists" over any others, to prevent the dominance of institutional groups, and to avoid inadequate or unbalanced representation of divisions of the fields of speech, sections of the country, or educational levels.

To state the issue positively, some members would like to change the structure and government of the Association to provide for broader representation for all interests within the field of speech, for all sections of the country, for all educational levels and institutional groups. They believe that it is time for an association approaching a membership of 6,000 to follow the example of other societies of similar size and type (e. g., American Psychological Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Modern Language Association) and to move on to a properly integrated, federated system of government, based on fair representation of all sections, all divisions of the field, and all educational levels.

One of the leading proponents for such a change is the immediate past President of the Association, Professor Wilbur E. Gilman of Queens College. In his presidential address at the Association luncheon in Chicago last December, President Gilman strongly recommended the structure and government of the Association be reorganized along specific lines in order to find a solution for some problems which he identified as dangerous to the future growth and development of our Association. At that same annual meeting an *ad hoc* Committee on Structure was appointed by the Committee on Committees and approved by the Executive Council. This

Mr. Bagwell (B.S., Akron, 1937; M.A., Wisconsin, 1938) is Professor of Speech and Head, Department of Communication Skills, at Michigan State College. He is Executive Vice-President of the Speech Association of America and Chairman of the ad hoc *Committee on Structure appointed at the Chicago Convention in 1951.*

Committee was instructed to study President Gilman's proposal and to report to the Council at its next annual meeting.

At the request of the editor of *QJS* Professor Gilman submitted an article which set forth in more detail, and with reasons, the various recommendations contained in his annual presidential address. This article was published in the April issue under the title "Unity in Diversity."

Since Professor Gilman proposed an extensive reorganization of the structure and government of the Association the editor requested me, as Chairman of the Committee on Structure, to plan a symposium for this issue of *QJS*.

To obtain a representative cross section of opinion regarding Professor Gilman's proposed plan of reorganization, I invited the following groups of persons to write responses to Professor Gilman's article:

1. All former presidents of the Association;
2. All former editors of *QJS* and of *Speech Monographs;*
3. All present and immediate past officers of independent and affiliated organizations such as ASHA, AETA, AFA, and NSSC;
4. All former executive secretaries of the Association;
5. All present regional association presidents;
6. Members of the Committee on Structure.

The responses printed on the following pages were those received on or before July 15.

We cordially invite members to send us their comments.

PAUL D. BAGWELL

Unity in SAA derives from those colleges where the instructor in speech is the "expert" in fundamentals, debate, theatre, interpretation, correction, etc. Unfortunately for this teacher, the specialties of speech have developed unevenly. The ASHA, which started with speech correction, is a movement far wider in scope than the scant subject matter and clinical interest that gave it rise. Wedded to hearing, the specialties that evolved from speech correction represent an applied science of the communicative process and have some marks of a pure science. Departments of Speech and Hearing (the science thereof) are on the horizon: oral and aural clinics (and stagefright); voice production, and language. *J.S.H.D.* will yield *disorders.* SAA can neither stem the tide nor maintain programs in this area fifteen years hence. With science and radio and television gone and theatre destined to follow, only rhetoric remains. Had rhetoric the vitality of its offspring, rhetoricians might plead hopefully for a speech federation like the American Psychological Association. A federation might have been encouraged to advantage twenty years ago, particularly to the financial advantage of the alert teacher in the small college who wants to keep abreast of the various subject matters (that he continues to teach in 1970).

JOHN BLACK,
The Ohio State University

The Gilman plan suggests that the independent organizations such as AETA and ASHA may function as departments of SAA without giving up their independence. Under the reorganization, if AETA, for example, were to function as the theatre department of SAA, its president would have to be chairman of the SAA department and its vice-president would have to be vice-chairman of that department. The Gilman plan specifies a method of electing department chairmen and vice-chairmen. The AETA constitution specifies a

method of electing the AETA president and vice-president. The two methods are not reconcilable.

But even if some workable interlocking of officers could be discovered, a moment's thought is enough to reveal that what is proposed is a kind of organizational schizophrenia. It is manifestly impossible for any organization to be *both* independent *and* subordinate to the SAA Council, as the department is to be under the plan.

From the point of view of the independent organizations, the plan comes fifteen years too late. Reintegration at the bottom is no longer a possibility. Thorough-going cooperation on a basis of equality at the top may still be possible. I should like to see *that* tried.

BARNARD HEWITT,
University of Illinois

My purpose here shall be to comment on Professor Gilman's proposals only from the viewpoint of the situation that gave rise to the organization of the American Forensic Association. And since I presume the intention of the proposal is to eliminate the cause for being of such groups as the AFA, I would like to express my opinion as to their probable effectiveness.

The AFA was organized *by* forensic coaches *for* forensic coaches on the assumption that theirs was a special interest of sufficient scope to warrant their associating themselves in their common purpose. Most were members of the SAA but many were not, particularly those on the high school level. It was the intention of the organizers to confine the membership primarily to "coaching coaches" who travel the tournament circuits rather than to "forensic directors" who are usually removed by seniority, promotion, or old age to an ivory tower above and away from the firing line.

The mere setting up of a "department" of the SAA devoted to forensics will not solve the problem, because ultimately it will evolve into the same situation which gave rise to the organization of the American Forensic Association. If in its operation this "department" could be made to serve the special interests of the "coaching coaches" as the AFA is doing, then the problem would be solved. This is to be desired and would be welcomed by most AFA members.

HUGO E. HELLMAN,
Marquette University

The scheme of organization which Professor Gilman has proposed appeals strongly to one's sense of order. It is logical that areas of special interest should be departmented. It is also logical that the various sections of the annual convention should be developed by the appropriate departments. And it is perfectly logical that each of these departments should be represented on the Executive Council.

Whether the plan is as practicable as it is logical depends upon the degree to which a good fit can be obtained between the departmental pattern and the needs of those who are members both of SAA and one or another of the various related but autonomous associations such as AETA and ASHA.

In the case of AETA I should think that the obvious first step would be to invite AETA to operate the Theatre Department with the thought that the department personnel would be made up of those who are members of both AETA and SAA and who presumably would act in the best interests of both associations. About one-eighth of the membership of SAA and about one-third of the members of AETA belong to both associations, and most of them are active in

both. They are more than enough to constitute a strong department.

LEE MITCHELL,
Northwestern University

One who holds, as many of us do, that speech is and should be continued as an integrated discipline must look upon the implications of Professor Gilman's proposal with some concern. That some aspects of his program merit serious consideration cannot be doubted; a pertinent question arises as to how unity and integration are to be achieved through the emphasizing of such differences as do exist among us more effectively than through stressing the points of contact and common interest.

The process of fragmentation has already begun, and unless steps are taken to bring about more balance within the structure of the Association and between the various phases of our field, more and more groups will be breaking away. When a member of the Association who is also deeply interested in one of the new organizations said to me not long ago, "*We* have decided to meet with *you* once more," the implication was obvious. There is altogether too much "we" and "you" amongst us. It would be difficult to devise a program more directly calculated to result in an intensification of that attitude, instead of a restoration of the essential unity of our field, than the full program which Professor Gilman has outlined.

Forty years ago Professor O'Neill was telling the National Council of Teachers of English that, having bungled the job of teaching public speaking, they were insisting nothing in it was worth teaching. One wonders whether, having bungled the job of integration within our own discipline, we may not, in fact, be arguing ourselves into thinking that it is not worth the doing. One might further paraphrase Professor Gilman's statement that "Too often college departments have been so much absorbed in their own problems that they have failed to meet the needs of elementary and secondary teachers," to the effect that "too often the teachers of specific areas in the field of speech have been so absorbed in their own interests (especially in the relation to the Association) that they have failed to recognize that there are a number of other aspects of speech of equal importance." And it is precisely the people in those other phases of speech that are growing restive, and threatening to draw away from the Association. Whether departmentalization is the answer is to be doubted.

GILES WILKESON GRAY,
Louisiana State University

As we have grown we have continued only dimly to realize that our business was to teach communication. In the super-specialization we have been emulating from other areas we have split the communication processes asunder. We did not wish to utilize the findings from many areas which were necessary for the increasing contribution only "speech" (in the larger sense) or communication can make. Only on the fringes were we seriously and deeply studying and teaching our functions. We had no unifying basis whereby public address, discussion, oral reading, theatre, radio, and speech correction could be put together to contribute toward interhuman understanding and teamwork.

The National Society for the Study of Communication was organized to provide this unifying basis not only for the speech arts and sciences but for the entire array of communications specialties. This organization is structured not only to give deeper level "speech" approaches their natural place as the integrating core in the curriculum, but also to encourage cooperative efforts with other

disciplines in improving communication at all levels of intra- and inter-group functioning. The organization is necessarily interdisciplinary as it goes about the building of an integrity in the whole area as a contribution to the total curriculum.

Provided that this organization were given the support necessary to continue the contributions it has undertaken, I would favor the general plan outlined by Professor Gilman. The task of the Society is primarily coordinating work in the whole area. Since speech is central for this purpose, speech teachers would have everything to gain. At the same time, with proper arrangements, the Society might best prosper under SAA auspices. But if we were relegated to some corner and limited to something like the basic course work, I suspect that that the atomizing would break out again. I am speaking only for myself, not as one of the founders and the present president of NSSC.

ELWOOD MURRAY,
University of Denver

In my opinion the proposed reorganization plan would promote better democracy within the Association in that it would supply smaller units in which the members may express their will. Elections would be much more direct than they now are. The present arrangement of general business meetings for election of a supplied slate of officers and council members offers no opportunity for expression by the individual members of the Association. The lowly member feels he has neither voice nor significant vote. In the new plan proposed by Professor Gilman, each member would first be a member of an interest group which would function only if each member functioned, electing his own group officers, who *ex officio* would be members of the Association Council. This plan seems to me highly desirable. In fact the proposed organization would meet an objection that has become a chronic complaint among the rank and file of the Association: that very little democracy is demonstrated in the Speech Association of America.

HELEN G. HICKS,
Hunter College of the City of New York

I recognize Professor Gilman's article as representing, first of all, an attempt to meet certain problems and needs arising out of changing conditions in the speech field. That the field is changing and that new problems are arising as a result, all concerned will take for granted, I assume. For example, speech is becoming more and more interesting to the members of various established areas of specialization such as psychiatry, neurology, otolaryngology, psychology, and education. It seems to me that we should try to make it advantageous for workers in these fields to join the Speech Association of America. We should also, I think, make an effort to keep informed of the uses that are being made of the knowledge and skills peculiar to the field of speech in these other areas. Specialization is becoming intensified in the various aspects of the field of speech as such. I feel personally that Professor Gilman has gone somewhat beyond the present trend of specialization in setting up his twelve departments. I think this is too many departments. I believe that at this stage there would be some advantage in a smaller number of somewhat larger groups. A basic question would have to do with the degree of autonomy to be granted these groups by the parent organization. I think it would be advantageous to grant each one enough autonomy to permit the maximum possible development. My final comment at this time is that it would seem essential that

certain groups, such as the American Speech and Hearing Association, be regarded for working purposes as independent of the Speech Association of America. If this is assumed I think that a measure of cooperation can be achieved and maintained that will be beneficial to all concerned.

WENDELL JOHNSON,
State University of Iowa

In approaching this problem of cooperation among the various areas of speech we must be realistic. We cannot set back the hands of the clock and we must not stop the clock. What's done cannot be undone. However, no one genuinely interested in his profession will deny that all areas of speech have some problems in common. It is where the interests merge that we need statesmanship. We can and must forget our special interests and work for the common promotion of the cause of speech in all its manifestations. Such common action will spring from a desire to further the interests of each special area. Such action will not be synthetic or forced. For example, if it is for the best interest of any group to meet with the Speech Association of America at the time of their national convention, let them do so. And if it is for the best interest of any group not to meet with the Speech Association of America, so be it. And if it is for the best interest of any group to pool its prestige with that of the other groups interested in speech to gain academic approval and recognition, let that group take the step. We need a supercommittee of devoted men and women who will see where the various interests merge and promote cooperation for the general good.

LIONEL CROCKER,
Denison University

The reverse of an old political dictum suggests the principle for any reorganization of our SAA—Divided we stand, united we go forward.

It is possible, of course, to have oneness in manifoldness; unity in multiplicity. I doubt the possibility of unity in diversity. The purpose of all organization is to develop an organism; the more diverse the parts, the more difficult it is to make an organization into an organism; in fact, it is impossible unless the parts are constituent and will merge into one dominant purpose. The best answer I know to Professor Gilman is Dr. Simon's article, "Fission or Fusion," in the CSSA *Journal* for November, 1950. It is time to make and keep humanistic speech the Sun in our solar system of speech-making when there is danger of the vying of many planets with each other to become the Sun. Let these planets of speech have their orbits, but let's keep the humanistic Sun in the center.

JOHN T. MARSHMAN,
28 Indian Springs Drive
Columbus, Ohio

A parlous danger of growth of autonomy of specialties within our field is that of separatism inside the school and college; not infrequently the formation of the national splinter organization is followed by clamor for separation from the college speech department. It is folly to forget that our hard-won educational prestige depends greatly upon our total speech function.

I have seen a long-established city-wide curriculum in speech reduced to insignificance by short-sighted speech teachers viewing their function as separate from rhetoric and linguistics. I recall a teacher of theatre in a college who divorced himself from the speech department, only to have his subjects dropped by the faculty shortly afterwards. I know of two separate college

departments, one radio, the other motion-pictures, which are in danger of elimination, an unlikely situation if they were tied in with speech.

As an effort to offset such educational disintegration, Professor Gilman's proposal seems worth trying.

ARLEIGH B. WILLIAMSON,
New York University

Can we have diversity in unity? The history of the educational process is simply the history of diversification, specialization, and research. As soon as the first educational discipline inspired an intellectual curiosity, the interest and skill of man began to diversify. Specialization arose and research flourished. New branches of learning appeared and new disciplines came into being. Our present day speech discipline is the result of this process. Its forward march is inevitable.

The speech curriculum that encourages the scholar to specialize, to carry out research, will contribute to the sum total of human knowledge. To be sure, our present curricula will be reshaped. Some phases of speech education will disappear; others will be enlarged, and others added. These new areas of instruction will naturally seek professional recognition in organizations and associations of their own. However, it must be remembered that although the Speech Association of America is young, it already occupies a powerful and influential position in the educational world. This eminence is the result of the unselfish devotion of professional-minded teachers of speech from the pioneer days to the present time who have *always* realized that in unity is strength. To depart from this policy now or in the future would be disastrous. New organizations and new associations that arise must add to and not detract from the mother organization, the Speech Association of America. Diversity is inevitable, unity indispensable.

G. E. DENSMORE,
University of Michigan

Dr. Wilbur Gilman's "Unity in Diversity" is a thoughtful document, and a move toward a goal much to be desired. Many, perhaps most, members will agree with it in principle, and discussion between those who agree and those who do not will develop fruitful analysis and ultimate refinement of the views.

Dr. Gilman's article does not undertake any extensive analysis of the causes of dissidence and secession within the SAA. Neither did a day-long round table presided over by Professor Kim Giffin during the CSSA convention at Tulsa in April. A consideration of causes should be useful. I venture to mention two, neither of them in the SAA, but rather in that critical area upon which all convention work focuses or should focus, the departments of instruction. For the splitting, seceding, splintering, or fragmentation at the national and regional levels is being reflected at the departmental level, where the actual damage is serious.

Why do departments split? I have been an unhappy observer of some splittings, and have adjudged that the causes usually are: (1) ambition of members of departments to achieve some sort of headship at whatever cost and (2) inflexibility of departments in adjusting curricula to accommodate vigorous "fields" within them. The damage is more than serious; it is literally incalculable; the casualness with which secessionists regard it is astonishing. Friendships are broken and cooperation rendered difficult or impossible; bitter competition for funds is set up; the rep-

utation of the university or college is besmirched for as much as a quarter of a century; worst of all, the preparation of students, especially in the splinter departments, is lopsided through over-specialization, though these same students are often unaware of the injustice being done to them. The pay-off comes when the students, upon graduating, cannot freely find positions, partly because most teachers must teach a variety of subjects instead of a specialty, and particularly because most departments will not employ teachers prepared by splinter groups, fearing trouble-making in as yet peaceful schools.

The caution against employing prospective fragmentationists is natural; departments would at the same time do well to grant reasonable freedom, especially in the curriculum, to their burgeoning groups. Often they find ways, too, to satisfy legitimate personal ambitions. Peace within departments may well reflect itself in peaceful national and regional organizations.

C. M. Wise,
Louisiana State University

We need a re-emphasis on the value of a *unified* profession which is strong in the academic and practical world. Our natural diversity of interests is still founded on the *common* objective of the study and development of oral communication in all its levels of performance. The significance of this common purpose is being ignored far too much in the councils of *all* our professional groups. If our professional association continues to fall apart, we will be unable to perform the total service that we now agree is vital to society. Our work will be swallowed up by those who do not have the understanding and the desire to facilitate our fundamental objectives. It is time we faced these probabilities.

Gilman's suggestion for departmental units sounds good to me. It is long overdue in our association. A strong department *within* the association can do all that is now being done by any of the special groups and more. The time has come to think more of the growth of the *whole profession* than of the personal power of single groups in and out of the councils of the association.

The "political" issues must take a back seat if we are to repair the bonds between our colleagues.

John Keltner,
University of Oklahoma

In Professor Gilman's article, "Unity in Diversity," two factors are immediately apparent. The first, his statement, "We should hold fast to the concept that the speech profession includes the whole body of teachers and scholars at all levels—" needs little discussion in spite of the attitude of some of our "flock" who feel lost in the inertia of the whole body. The second, the present existence of organizations within our field, indicates that as an association we have been so retarded in our planning and thinking that we are almost too late for the proposed plan. True, these specialized groups do not meet the need of the majority in our educational system, but will these established associations give any concessions or any time to work in a departmental status with the parent SAA? Those who have the fundamental point of view of Speech, will; but our more recent "specialists" who wear the blinders of concentrated fields of study probably will not. An immediate process of speech education seems to be indicated.

Roy D. Mahaffey,
Linfield College

Our Speech Association undeniably faces major problems, and Dr. Gilman's proposal would seem to alleviate the

most serious. We have grown great primarily because we have not fought, but have welcomed and helped to develop various special-interest groups arising within the over-all speech field. Certainly our first responsibility should be "to encourage cooperation and coordination" so that all interested teachers may "utilize the research and attain the professional standards" of our affiliated groups.

The key to our problems may lie within already established speech departments. As these departments break up, the Association tends to follow suit. If we achieve "unity in diversity," it will be because our departmental chairmen continually stress the loyalty owed to the Speech Association, parent of most of our specialties.

RALPH G. NICHOLS,
University of Minnesota

Professor Gilman's article offers a masterly analysis of our situation and our needs and a statesmanlike proposal for better organization. We need the strength that can come only through unity. We need a larger Council to make our various interest-groups better acquainted with each other. We need more stable organization of each such interest group, not only for better program-making at national conventions, but for the maintenance of the various projects now left to committees that report too infrequently to their natural constituencies. Better communication between groups and within groups is well worth the effort to perfect the needed constitutional changes.

H. A. WICHELNS,
Cornell University

Although I have always been strongly in favor of maintaining the present structure of unity in the Speech Association of America, I am forced, after a careful study of Professor Wilbur Gilman's article on "Unity in Diversity," to agree with his point of view and with the proposals which he has made.

In my opinion, however, if the SAA is to continue as one of the leading educational organizations, special consideration should be given, before any change in organization is made, to the following points:

1. The SAA should be the official spokesman for all the departments in negotiations with other organizations and agencies.

2. Since the first vice-president of the SAA has an over-all view of the program, he should have the final decision on the number of programs to be sponsored by each department.

3. A petition for a new department should be signed by at least 100 members of the SAA.

MAGDALENE KRAMER,
Teachers College,
Columbia University

The plan of Professor Gilman offers advantages conducive to an improved national organization. Surely the plan is not a signal for disintegration or disruption of the Speech Association of America; rather it is a means of working more effectively as we, also, provide an operational structure for improving our identifications with whatever special interests and fields are inevitable in our professional lives. It is doubtful if many categorize themselves simply as General Speech Teachers. Specialization is inevitable. The plan is not so rigid (or should not be) as to prevent a given person from active identification with more than one group. I do not fear for the solidarity of our profession if such a plan should be adopted; on the contrary, I would anticipate a greater unity.

DALLAS C. DICKEY,
University of Florida

This conclusion, reluctantly arrived at, is a sort of concession to necessity. I prefer the present structure of the Association to the carefully conceived plan of Professor Gilman. However, I believe that the size and complexity of our organization, coupled with the ever-increasing likelihood of our losing important divisions through withdrawal or separation, necessitate our turning to a departmental system.

If we accept Professor Gilman's general proposal, I suggest:

1. That we safeguard as fully as possible the position of the SAA as the over-all body with authority to represent the field in educational and administrative circles;

2. That we keep the departmental set-up on the simplest administrative level consistent with effective operation. Under the proposed plan, it is not hard to envisage complicated, if not downright unnecessary and duplicative, business transactions;

3. That the provision governing the establishment of new departments be strict. Rather than permit fifty members to petition for departmental status, I believe the number should be increased to at least one hundred.

LESTER THONSSEN,
College of the City of New York

Wilbur Gilman's proposal for the reorganization of our national Association, if given the searching and whole-hearted analysis and discussion it deserves, may prove to be a major step in the growth of our profession. Undoubtedly more specific development of many of the special interests within our field is needed. Certainly an urgent need exists for greater working unity of all the various areas in the study of speech, lest our present separatist tendencies scatter our forces and weaken our effectiveness even before we have achieved an adequately strong and stable position in the educational world. The coalescing and integrating of opposing tendencies toward diversity and unity is perhaps the most important problem in our field today.

Of course, many questions will arise regarding details of the proposed reorganization. Among these details may be the following:

1. Will establishment of twelve departments as a beginning constitute too much fragmentation? Should we start with a lesser number of larger and stronger departments and let specialization be increased later if further experience shows a need?

2. What will be the working arrangements between the proposed departments and present committees? To what extent would present committees be replaced?

3. The proposed addition of 36 members to the Executive Council would approximately double its size. What would be the result on its effectiveness as an *executive* group? Would it tend to become more a legislative body for the entire Association? If so, should the size of the Council be increased even more and a smaller committee with distinctively executive functions be set up within the larger body? Perhaps the duties and powers, as well as the size, of the Council need to be re-examined. Certainly an association of 6000 members needs broader representation than it now has.

Problems such as these are relatively minor, however, when compared with larger considerations of will and purpose. How strongly do the various groups within our profession *want* to maintain unity? To what extent are we all teachers of speech first and pursuers of our various special interests second? Is our work motivated by a deep and abiding philosophy of speech as the primary social and intellectual process

which binds all our special interests and approaches together in one great program of study and teaching? To the extent that we are primarily specialists, we may as well save ourselves any further "sound and fury" about colleague Gilman's proposal. Organizational machinery is not a substitute for purpose and vision. On the other hand, if a dominant majority among us are students and teachers of *speech* more than of various specialisms, that is, if a genuine spirit of unity exists among us, then adequate machinery can be devised and made effective for implementing that unity in the midst of diversity. If this larger will and purpose are present, Professor Gilman's proposal may well be the preliminary blueprint for an improved and more effective professional organization.

HORACE G. RAHSKOPF,
University of Washington

I am loath to disagree with Professor Gilman, because I fully appreciate his attempt to bring some sort of order out of something uncomfortably close to chaos. It seems to me, however, that his proposed breakdown into departments would just extend the problem. Will not further "split-offs" occur, for example, into such departments as Law and Politics, Rhetoric, Linguistic Science, in fact, developments which we cannot even surmise at this time. Entirely new avenues may be ahead for future teachers of speech.

After all, the old categories Public Speaking, Oral Interpretation, etc., offer sufficient framework for our purpose.

LOUIS M. EICH,
University of Michigan

The departmentalization of the Speech Association of America is a logical next step for our professional organization. This step should not be taken, however, until the basic problem of departmental classification is thought through to the satisfaction of our principal minority groups as well as the membership as a whole. Otherwise departmentalization may create more problems than it solves for the profession.

The proposed Gilman classification creates both classification and semantic problems. *Communication* includes *Fundamentals* but apparently not *Voice*, *Articulation*, and *Phonetics*. These seem to me to be fundamental. To a number of our people the title *Communication* has come to stand for an integrated program in general education. Are we ready to accept this view as our preferred philosophy in this area? Many of our voice scientists use the word with quite a different meaning. Is *Psychology* to be limited to *Communication? Public Opinion* is classified as *Rhetoric and Public Address* and given no consideration as *Speech Science*. I should prefer to go along with the Simon philosophy that *Speech Science* be considered a method of studying many of our problems rather than a content area. *Speech in Government, Business, and Industry* is *Communication*, yet an entire department is proposed for *Adult Speech Education*. Is *Forensics* not Public Address? Etc. Etc.

Why not begin with departmentalization which corresponds with the outlines which have proved a workable basis for classifying our literature? I should propose some such series of departments as the following:

1. *Fundamentals of Speech* or *General Speech* to include *Communication* and general aspects of *Voice* and *Phonetic Science*.
2. *Rhetoric and Public Address*
3. *Interpretative Reading*
4. *Radio and Television*
5. *Theatre*

6. *Speech and Hearing Disorders*
7. *Speech Education*

Let us give the matter the research it needs before making decisions which we should not attempt to impose from above.

FRANKLIN H. KNOWER,
The Ohio State University

Wilbur Gilman's general proposal for securing unity in diversity of the Speech Association of America by creating twelve departments is sensible. Many will support it at the Convention.

Some of the organizational aspects and details will obviously need revision.

The twelve departments proposed need reclassification. Category 1, *Communication,* is too broadly labelled. *Oral Communication* more nearly approximates the "fundamentals of speech" concept. If written composition is to be stressed also, then *Oral and Written Communication* should designate the area as set off from the "mass" communication.

Category 3, *Forensics,* should be combined with Category 4, *Discussion and Group Methods.* Both complementary units are necessary in any well-rounded teaching program of controversial speaking. The suggested dichotomy is unfortunate. For a national group so to separate the two is to do adequate service to neither. This area of argumentation, discussion, debate, and persuasion should be developed as a closely "integrated" unit of solving conflicts through deliberation.

Category 8, *Theatre, Motion Pictures, and Television,* and Category 9, *Broadcasting,* should be rearranged as follows: Category 8, *Theatre and the Cinema;* Category 9, *Radio and Television.*

A. CRAIG BAIRD,
State University of Iowa

COMMENTARIES

A MEANS TO UNITY

So much for what lies behind us. Now what of the future?

The National Association has the following purposes in view. First, we wish to promote and encourage research. . . . Our second main purpose is to publish the *Quarterly Journal.* Through this periodical we hope to distribute to all the profession the results of research investigation. We intend that it shall be the organ of the teachers of public speaking throughout the country, and as such shall contain reviews, articles, discussions, and news items of vital interest to teachers of public speaking. In short we propose a national organ owned and controlled by the public-speaking teachers of the whole country, of a character that will stand comparison with the professional journals of our colleagues in other departments. We expect the *Quarterly Journal* to serve the teachers of public speaking as other professional journals serve teachers in other fields. The success of our whole movement for more thorough scholarship and better teaching is closely dependent upon the success of the *Quarterly Journal.* It is through the *Journal* that we must always reach the majority of teachers; and through the *Journal* that those who cannot attend conventions may keep in touch with what is being done by others and give the results of their work to their fellow-workers. Here we will have at once a means of communication between ourselves and the gathering together of much of that tangible part of the products of our labor by which the profession as a profession will largely be judged by others. . . .—J. M. O'Neill, "The National Association," *The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking,* I (April, 1915), 56-57.

THE FORUM

ONE OR MANY

The question whether the artistic, educational, scholarly, and scientific aspects of speech are to be represented by one or many organizations was posed by Professor Gilman in his presidential address[1] and discussed by leaders in the field in Professor Bagwell's symposium in the current issue.[2] We do not presume to have all the answers or even to know all the right questions; we wish only to suggest some directions which further inquiries might take.

Should it not be understood by all concerned that the discussion is one of expediency or policy, not of morals or ethics? The rights to hire a hall, to hold a convention, and to form an association are the privilege of every American. Indeed, they are guaranteed in the Constitution. Anyone who wishes to promote or to form an organization ancillary to or even competitive with the Speech Association of America is clearly within his rights. Would not old-timers and new-comers alike do well to assume at the outset the perfect right of anybody to organize and promote enterprises in the field of speech?

The issues remaining are those of policy. Without attempting to exhaust the list of questions and without suggesting that any question proposed carries a single answer, we submit the following categories:

In Education: Can one organization or many best serve the needs of students? Can curricula best be planned for theatre, or public address, or interpretation, or speech correction; or can course offerings, electives, and majors best be surveyed and determined cooperatively? Obviously, different answers will be found for these questions.

In Research: Can one organization or many best serve the needs of scientists and scholars for a clearing house of research? Can scientists and scholars in the several areas gain more by concentration of attention among like-minded specialists, or by associating with other persons of different habit of mind?

In Publication: Can one organization or many best carry on the publishing required by the manifold interests in speech? Does publication of scholarly work in the speech areas suffer or profit from the number of journals available?

In Administration: Can one office or many best serve the constituency or constituencies? Are the interests of members so varied as to suggest a need for separate placement bureaus, advertising programs, and avenues of support? Will the means available or anticipated support one or many organizations at a proper level? Is there a point at which any professional organization becomes inefficient through sheer numbers? If so, has any organization in the field of speech reached that point? Does a multiplicity of organization necessarily mean a duplication of effort?

[1] Wilbur E. Gilman, "Unity in Diversity," *QJS*, XXXVIII (April 1952), 123-132.

[2] Paul D. Bagwell, "The Gilman Plan for the Reorganization of the Speech Association of America: A Symposium," *QJS*, XXXVIII (October 1952), 331-342.

The leaderships of the organizations now existing have no doubt considered the foregoing questions and many others—and will continue to consider them. But perhaps the over-ruling consideration is not to be found in a strict problem-analysis. Perhaps the differences in personality, in temperament, and in outlook among those who characteristically view speech as primarily a matter of art, or of fact, or of probability are too pronounced ever to justify the expectations of one organization, rather than many, no matter what presumably logical or rational grounds might be alleged.

Could not all agree, however, in one assumption: Whatever form of organization may be given to the speech discipline or disciplines, the persons now working in the various areas will be happier and wiser if they approach their common problems and each other in good humor and with good cheer?

B. A.

NATIONAL DEBATE PROPOSITION AND DISCUSSION QUESTION FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1952-53

As of August 15, 1952, the Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion of the Speech Association of America announces the results of the preferential poll to determine the proposition and the question for nation-wide use during the season of 1952-53. The debate proposition is:

RESOLVED: That the Congress of the United States should enact a compulsory Fair Employment Practices Law.

The Discussion question is:

How can we most effectively combat the threat of communism?

If circumstances require a change during the season, the Committee may, by a three-fifths vote, alter the wording or move to a second-choice proposition or question. Any "official" interpretation is forbidden. Your representative on the Committee will be pleased to supply further information concerning the rules under which we operate. Questions may also be brought up in the open meeting of the Committee during the national convention.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM HOWELL (Delta Sigma Rho)
GLENN JONES (Phi Rho Pi)
LARRY NORTON (Pi Kappa Delta)
GLEN MILLS (S. A. A.)
T. EARLE JOHNSON (Tau Kappa Alpha), *Chairman*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO NOMINATE EDITORS

As President of the Speech Association of America I have designated the following Committee to present nominations for the editorships to be filled at the meeting of the Executive Council to be held in Cincinnati in December: H. P. Constans, University of Florida; G. E. Densmore, University of Michigan, *Chairman;* W. E. Gilman, Queens College; Kenneth G. Hance, Northwestern University; Horace G. Rahskopf, University of Washington.

The Committee reports the following nominations to be presented to the Executive Council in December: for the editorship of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* for the term 1954-1957, Wilbur Samuel Howell, Princeton University; for the editorship of *Speech Monographs* for the term 1954-1957, J. Jeffery Auer, University of Virginia.

LIONEL CROCKER, *President*
Speech Association of America

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

EARNEST BRANDENBURG, *Editor*

ON GENERAL EDUCATION

Elbert W. Harrington

Aside from the Harvard Report and parts of the Chicago Report[1] the *Fifty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* is the most provocative book yet to appear on the subject of general education.[2] It will stimulate much thoughtful discussion; many an educator will try to classify himself according to Harold Taylor's analysis of current educational philosophies.

But if the last is now first, we may be sure that the first will not be the last. General education is on the move, whether we like it or not, and other books will appear. Doubtless many manuscripts are now in process. Books are not the only sign of activity. Since 1946 have appeared *The Journal of General Education,* and now *Notes and Comments on General Education,* published three times a year by the National Committee on General Education of the Department of Higher Education. Almost anyone can find a conference on general education to attend, and if he is alert he may even be awarded an internship that will permit a study of the subject in some selected institution. Make no mistake. A group of determined and able men are now in control, and they will not be laughed or scorned out of court.[3] In addition, enough institutions have now adopted one variety or another of general education to carry the issue beyond the bounds of theory. It will be tested by time—the final arbiter.

With all this activity the meaning of the term *general education* should be clear, but it is not; that is, no general agreement exists. Most of the arguments about general education arise from perplexity or from semantic origins. Many adherents are like the perplexed man who stood in the street of one of our western towns holding a piece of rope. When asked about his difficulty, he replied that he was trying to make up his mind whether he had found a piece of rope or had lost a horse.

The *Fifty-First Yearbook* makes its contribution by analyzing the philosophical, psychological, social, and pedagogical bases of general education. Such questions are raised as: How does general education fit into the various contemporary philosophies of education? How many of us are entitled to higher

Mr. Harrington (Ph.D., Iowa, 1938) is Professor of Speech and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of South Dakota.

[1] *General Education in a Free Society.* Report of the Harvard Committee (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945). *The Idea and Practice of General Education,* an account of the University of Chicago Press, by present and former members of the faculty (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1950).

[2] Part I *General Education,* prepared by the Society's Committee, Stephen M. Corey, Clarence Faust, Robert J. Havighurst, T. R. McConnell (Chairman), Earl J. McGrath, Harold Taylor, and Jacob Van Ek, ed. Nelson B. Henry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952).

[3] Howard Mumford Jones, for example, heaped scorn on the movement in his review of *General Education in Transition* in *The Saturday Review of Literature,* XXXIV (September 8, 1951), 17.

education? What teaching problems are involved in the new approach?

Such questions suggest that general education is, in part, an attitude, and so it is. It is an attitude of acceptance of the mass education which has moved up from the high schools into the colleges. It calls for a study of the needs of these students to the end that courses can better be adapted to them; it insists that the arts and sciences be given their rightful role in higher education.

These attitudes extend into the realm of teaching. Good teaching means more than a good voice and appearance, and even more than knowledge of subject matter. It means a careful appraisal of the role of the teacher.[4] It means a distinct effort to understand the students being taught.[5] It means an understanding of the various modes of presenting material and arousing interests, and the proper time and place for each. It means a fresh and continuing look at such matters as advisement of students, test materials and procedures, training and selection of teachers. General education has again turned attention to these and other aspects of good teaching.

For some reason, most of the emphasis in general education has been on curricular developments. In developing a curriculum for liberal education a guiding principle is breadth. Breadth implies work in all of the great areas of knowledge—sciences and mathematics, social sciences, and humanities. At least since Aristotle, breadth has never implied a mastery of all knowledge. Breadth implies selectivity.

What is the correct method of selection? Survey courses? These have no defenders today, although these courses were in vogue not long ago. Intensive development of selected units covering a wide field? This is the most common arrangement in general education, and many believe that these courses serve the average student best. Intensive development of units within a narrow field, such as American history from 1850 to 1860? Such a development is seriously proposed by many. Specific courses in the various departments, such as chemistry 1, government 1, etc? This is the standard pattern of most liberal arts colleges.

Reactions to such a program depend in part on temperament and in part on understanding of general education. As to attitude, most of us have accepted the mass of students who have come to us, and we are looking for more. We may not wholly understand them, but no widespread protest is raised against any attempt to understand them better. As to the necessity of a liberal or general foundation for specialization, many of us have committed ourselves deeply. We should be happy that general education has caused colleges, including teacher training institutions, to examine anew their programs of liberal education.

As to improvement of teaching, every administrator should welcome this emphasis. A veteran dean of a college of arts and sciences in one of our state universities has said that if he were starting again he would make improvement of instruction his first order of business.

As to changes in the curriculum, time and experimentation will finally determine what courses we should require and how they should be organized. If we assume that much of the specific information taught will be forgotten or that it will grow out-of-date, the major

[4] See G. W. Stewart, "Positive Catalyst or Direct Contributor," *The Journal of Higher Education*, XXIII (February 1952), 75 ff. Dr. Stewart was a catalyst, at least, in the formation of the general education program at the State University of Iowa.

[5] See such works as Ruth E. Eckert, *Outcomes of General Education* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943); C. Robert Pace, *They Went to College* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1941); Cornelia T. Williams, *These We Teach* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943).

purpose may well be to build proper attitudes and inculcate proper habits of work. If so, the major question may become: Can these results be achieved more effectively from courses that attempt to establish relationships and to point up practical problems of work-a-day living, or from courses that permit a student to see how a chemist or political scientist goes about his business? The charge is made by proponents of general education that the latter method leads to specialization and fine points of the subject, whereas the average student needs a non-specialized approach and a discussion of the kind of problems which he must inevitably face in life. A beginning study of a specialty, however, is not specialization. The average person most needs an appreciation of the depth and complicated nature of most areas of knowledge and of the role of the specialist in society; if he learns how a chemist thinks, he can appreciate how a zoologist thinks, or a botanist, or a geologist, or a physicist, for knowledge about practical problems may change, but the specialist we shall have with us always. From the point of view of the curriculum this is the key question, and the answer is by no means clear if we assume with each approach an equal ability of teachers and genuine concern about good teaching.

Of curriculum, teaching, and attitude, the perhaps unfortunate fact is that the major emphasis in general education has been on curriculum. It really should have a low third place. A good curriculum is important, but given a chance, a group of good teachers with the proper attitudes will make any curriculum function. The teacher always has been and always will be the chief instrument of higher education. Let us not become worried about curriculum so long as we keep our best teachers in touch with students. In fact, much can be said for building the curriculum around the superior teachers and changing it as the superior teachers change.

Teachers of speech and English can catch their bearings by applying all these questions to the communications program. Has this program adequately met the failures recounted by advocates of general education? Has the communications program led to better teaching? Has it changed the attitudes of students toward either speech or English? Has it led to more improvement than might have occurred with any other method. Some persons may ask how general education differs from liberal education. Why raise such a question? The general direction is the same for both; only the side roads differ, and most of them are simply detours which may be rough and dusty but eventually lead back to the main thoroughfare.

WOODROW WILSON BIBLIOGRAPHY: A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HIS WRITINGS, ADDRESSES, AND PUBLIC PAPERS. By Laura Shearer Turnbull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948; pp. 171. $2.00.

LEADERS OF MEN BY WOODROW WILSON. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by T. H. Vail Motter. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952; pp. ix+70. $2.00.

WOODROW WILSON: SOME PRINCETON MEMORIES. By George McLean Harper, Robert K. Root, Edwin S. Corwin, William Starr Myers, Edwin Grant Conklin, Luther P. Eisenhart, and J. Duncan Spaeth. Edited by William Starr Myers. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946; pp. vii+91. $1.50.

WILSON: THE ROAD TO THE WHITE HOUSE. By Arthur S. Link. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947; pp. xvii+570. $5.00.

A sheaf of books by or about Woodrow Wilson beautifully manufactured by the Princeton University Press!

The compiler of the bibliography, Laura Shearer Turnbull, is Curator of the Woodrow Wilson Collection in the Princeton University Library. She has done an excellent and most

useful job, and although her compilation is limited to published works and is described as selected, it is done on inclusive lines and for most purposes is certainly adequate. To it is added a compilation of "Newspaper Reports of Woodrow Wilson's Speeches, Statements and Papers, 1910-1912," by Arthur S. Link, a valuable bibliographical contribution in a field in which there is perhaps more to do. There is also a selected general bibliography of "Books in the Woodrow Wilson Field" by Katharine E. Brand—113 items. The reviewer does not find anywhere in the book any mention or evidence of the use of a bibliography of the writings of Woodrow Wilson compiled by Harry Clemens, although his recollection is that new ground was broken by that bibliographer.

Leaders of Men, delivered by Woodrow Wilson as a commencement address at the University of Tennessee on June 17, 1890, is a hitherto unpublished work of very considerable length—17,000 words or more—and of very careful workmanship. In it Wilson expounds his theory of leadership in a free society and what he says throws light on his subsequent utterances and on his career, particularly his attitude toward his fellow citizens. Leadership is a function of knowing and doing, and neither state by itself is satisfactory. A leader is not limited to particular ages, times, or causes, but discharges a general function. He lends sight to the blind forces of public thought, and his sole method is persuasion. Wilson had always the tantalizing belief that he was a man of destiny, and when he wrote this essay his bark was temporarily becalmed. While he worked out a general theme in the philosophy of government, he was at the same time studying his own situation and possibly charting his own course. The essay is therefore extremely intimate, and Professor Motter, whose introductory essay is a model of sympathy, intelligence, and insight, suggests quite plausibly that Wilson's unwillingness to reveal his inward struggle caused him to withhold the essay from publication.

Woodrow Wilson: Some Princeton Memories is a peculiarly friendly and interesting little book, and one can only rejoice that it has been published. It is written by a group of clever and important men, men who would scorn to be swayed from the line of truth; yet they are now well on in years, and this fact makes itself felt. Some of the essays are slightly sentimental, others over-cautious, and some show—a thing that may be regarded forgivably—a disposition to magnify the importance of their authors.

The largest book in this group and the one that offers the greatest challenge is *Wilson: The Road to the White House* by Arthur S. Link. Since it provokes disagreement, if not resentment, let us see if we can find a vantage ground from which to view it. Bacon has a statement to the effect that the fact that the parts of a rational system are in agreement with each other is no proof of the truth of the system as a whole. In this case, in dealing with a figure so surrounded with controversy as was Woodrow Wilson, it would follow that, if a historian began by adopting as truth the case against Wilson as worked out and adhered to by Wilson's enemies and went through the records for the purpose of proving these pre-conceived theses, his work would embody only such truth as resides in an organized and considered opposition. If therefore a formal opinion is accepted and defended, there can be no such thing as a "radical revaluation and interpretation." One can only say, "Wilson's enemies were right." The thesis of this book is "Wilson was a headstrong and determined man who was usually able to rationalize his actions with the moral law and to reconcile his position with the divine will," who failed at Princeton, Trenton, and Washington. That Wilson failed is the doctrine of his enemies, and of course it is merely abusive to say that Wilson identified his opinions as to what is right with the divine will. Wilson would have been a fool and a fanatic to have mistaken himself for God. It is certainly unfair and uninformed to say that Wilson did not make an habitual effort to arrive at truth before he became headstrong about it. The opinion that Wilson was incapable of change is refuted by the book itself, which teems with instances of Wilson's altering views as he passed from a relative conservatism to a rather vigorous progressivism. It does not alter the fact of mental flexibility to attribute these changes, as the author often does, to motives of personal interest. In order to believe that Wilson might sincerely alter his political opinions it is necessary to believe in the existence of political (and moral) principles. One who believes with the late John Dewey that, "The moment philosophy supposes it can find a final and comprehensive solution, it ceases to be inquiry and becomes either apologetics or propaganda," will have difficulty understanding, much less sympathizing with, Woodrow Wilson. To Wilson, for example, Adam Smith's teachings about trade and tariffs were important discoveries; to his biographer they have only incidental importance, and are to be labeled "Manchester School" and placed in their pigeonhole;

Wilson's idea that our system of government is an evolution, or rather a series of happy discoveries synthesized into the British and American system of representative government, is merely "political Darwinism." The point is that Wilson believed in such ideas and based on them what he considered his principles.

One might tolerate some degree of inflexibility in these fundamentals of belief, but one grows suspicious when one observes a disposition to belittle Wilson unnecessarily and with doubtful justification. Wilson was a superficial thinker, we are told; his general reading was desultory, spasmodic, and his judgments on literature were usually arbitrary. The ideas in *Congressional Government* were not original, and the book is not profound. Wilson's insight was not penetrating—many ideas were borrowed without acknowledgment from Gamaliel Bradford. Wilson accepted *all* of Bagehot's fundamental premises; even his style, like that of Bagehot, was "conversational and condescending." A serious charge is made of plagiarism of certain articles and editorials in the *Nation*, an improbable charge. Perhaps the ideas were the current coin of these reformers; possibly Wilson thought the ideas were his own; certainly Wilson was too opulent mentally to have made furtive use of the words and thoughts of others. *The State* (1889) is oddly praised as "Wilson's greatest scholarly achievement" and is yet said to depend chiefly on *Das Handbuch des Öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart*. Such a dependent work could hardly be called scholarship at all.

Wilson is presented as a denizen of an "ivory-tower," a man who had known nothing of "the hard struggle of existence" of his time. There is no evidence that Wilson was a wealthy youth or that he led a sheltered existence. He certainly knew the struggles that go into hard study, and it takes something of the sting out of the author's charge to recall that at the end of his professorial period, when the reviewer first met him, he was remarkable for his sympathy for the poor and the unfortunate. In face of the facts of Wilson's whole career it is doubtful if the world can be persuaded that he was not a tender-hearted man who loved his fellowmen. Just how damaging is the charge that, although by the end of the nineteenth century Wilson had arrived "at a fairly definite economic and political philosophy," it was "derived from historical study, not from experience in competitive struggle?" Generally speaking the statement is true, but is historical study necessarily false or misleading, and is the philosophy derived from competitive struggle necessarily superior? It would probably be superior in the minds of the disciples of *Real-Politik*, and from the same source some amelioration arises of the author's statement that Wilson was "never an economist." Wilson was uninfluenced by *Real-Ökonomik* and did not know the work of Sir Geoffrey Keynes.

Wilson's "prolific decade," 1890-1900, is somewhat too inclusively described as a period of "aristocratic affectations and obviously strained literary style." This is a hard saying, as is the statement that Wilson's political beliefs before 1913 are too full of incongruities and contradictions to be capable of study as a whole. These denunciations, be it noted, are nowhere compensated for by the least appreciation of volumes of finely chiseled prose or by any acknowledgment of superior political insight. The statement that Wilson was conservative is not helpful, since it is apparently not realized that Wilson was at the same time ardently democratic. *Division and Reunion* ought to have made this point clear. The reviewer heard Wilson make two statements that bear on this issue. Wilson said that in their social manifestations the perfect aristocrat and the perfect democrat were almost indistinguishable; also that democracy was a force that demanded equality of privilege and could not in its very nature be satisfied by the mere generosity of the aristocrat. Wilson's conservatism lay in the preservation of what he considered the established principles of representative democratic government. However, it is probably true that, when he entered politics, he did not understand "even faintly the workings of the political machine, the activities of the ward heeler, or the multifarious ramifications of everyday political practice."

Perhaps Wilson's two orations on Princeton in the nation's service, delivered in 1896 and in 1902, needed to be taken more seriously by this biographer than they have been; and also by the trustees of Princeton University. They constitute an honest effort to express Wilson's educational principles, principles even now not entirely unhinged by pragmatical considerations. Something of a shock was no doubt produced by his trying to live up to these principles. He would undertake to teach men "the life that is in them," teach them the disinterested truths of science, the truths of philosophy, and the literature that is "the permanent record of the human spirit." This is not mere rhetoric, but a solemn declaration of the war that has been waged and partly lost during the last half-century. The author understands and presents

without disapproval Wilson's revision of the curriculum and his purpose in establishing the Preceptorial System, with the hopes that attended it. That system left examinations in the hands of teachers and therefore failed to yield its full results, but the author does not see that, nor does he of course comprehend what went on in those five momentous years from 1905 until 1910.

About the next steps that Wilson took the author goes seriously wrong, or possibly gets beyond his depth. No good purpose can be served after forty-five years by misrepresenting either through ignorance or partisanship Dr. Wilson's intentions. He stated them clearly. He believed, wrongly or rightly, that the social organization of the student body then in operation at Princeton hindered and diminished the intellectual life of the place. He said to the reviewer, "The students do not listen to you, because they do not believe that it is to their interest to do so. If you rented a window in Wall Street at some busy hour of the day and shouted to the people rushing by, 'Hold on! I want to tell you about the poet Chaucer,' what would they say to you, if they stopped at all? They would tell you they were busy making a living, and so our students tell you they are busy making a club." There was no mystery and no malice about this issue. Wilson thought the social primacy of the upperclass clubs was working against the Princeton of his professed ideals. When he was a student at the College of New Jersey, it was an honest rather unfashionable institution devoted to the education of the sons of ordinary business and professional men of the Middle States and Maryland. He no doubt idealized it beyond its deserts, but it pleased his inborn democracy, and he thought of it as a place which had fostered vital intellectual and democratic contacts and the "comradeship of a common life with common ends." He believed that the ends of a university were "not primarily social but intellectual." Wilson did not attack the clubs as such, for he thought them excellent institutions of their kind. He wanted to make them into greater institutions than they were, and it is most gratifying to remember how generously the members of these undergraduate clubs approved of his plan. He held them utterly blameless and sought their support. There was no secrecy about his proposal to transform these clubs into colleges. The reviewer knew all about it, and he was not a person of importance. About this and other matters the author has been misinformed. The opposition to his plan started slowly and came as a surprise to Wilson himself. He had sought, he said, to minimize class distinctions, not appropriate in a university, and to unify Princeton in a happier and higher life. He was distressed at the suggestion that he was trying to pull anybody down.

When he minimizes the club-quadrangle issue as compared to that of the location of the graduate college, the author is much mistaken. The basal issue was the social issue and not the academic issue. There was room for difference of opinion as to where the buildings of the graduate college should be located. Wilson's idea was that having graduate students live with undergraduates might help to attain a higher level of intellectual life, and he thought also that graduate students ought to live near libraries and laboratories, but the matter was not really crucial. Certain financial reasons, as well as reasons of fixed professional purposes, have always stood in the way of much mingling of these two kinds of students in American universities. So much heat had already been generated that the question of the graduate college was warped, misunderstood, and given undue prominence. The reviewer was an undergraduate teacher in those days, and he remembers with some chagrin how quietly and excellently the undergraduates were pursuing their lives while this battle of the gods was echoing in the clouds.

Another matter, small to be sure, in which the author is almost certainly mistaken is in his belief that the alumni overwhelmingly sided against Wilson on the debated issues. Such a matter is naturally hard to determine. The reviewer was widely acquainted in the Princeton of those days, and he thinks that the alumni as a whole supported Wilson. The only actual ground for the formation of an opinion is disregarded by the author. In June, 1910, an election of an alumni trustee occurred; the Wilson candidate was elected by a large majority. The author merely says with some implication of malice that Wilson caused his enemy to be defeated.

As the chapter called "The Battle of Princeton" goes on it becomes an unpleasant polemic. Wilson's anger, disappointment, and indignation, and the passionate words he uttered in the heat of controversy are called "psychological intoxication." Much is made of the famous Pittsburgh speech, which indeed was so violent that it was published, with "Some Comments," by the opposition. One does not recall the spectacle with any pleasure. Wilson, a very human creature, was merely going down fight-

ing; this biographer does not understand that Wilson was incapable of compromising what he considered matters of principle. Back of the whole affair lay the map of national politics. Indeed, Wilson was never adequately supported by a group among the alumni to whom, to use a phrase from Dr. Patton's prayer, "it hath pleased Almighty God to intrust the possession of great wealth." Only the generosity of a limited number of wealthy personal friends enabled Wilson to do what he did. This part of the book is certainly very bad history, exemplifies indeed that argument in a circle in which an author, having made up his mind beforehand, so selects his material as to make it establish his position.

Further on in the book, better historical work appears, work based on careful and laborious research with determination of fact much to be praised. At its basis lies a Ph.D. dissertation apparently on Woodrow Wilson's campaign for the presidency in 1912. The parts of the biography covering this original subject are relatively free from prejudice against Wilson. To this first part the author has added much excellent historical investigation of Wilson's candidacy for the governorship of New Jersey and of his career as governor. The author has real talent in the history of politics, and in this part he stops only now and then to belabor Wilson or to suggest selfish motives for changes in political views. His antipathy to Wilson is mainly, but not exclusively, confined to the earlier chapters, which, it will be noted, were last written.

The general plan, however, as referred to in the preface, bodes ill for Wilson. The author tells us that he will continue the story from the point of Wilson's entrance into the White House to the end of Wilson's life. The preface and other parts by inference tell us that the author has already decided that Wilson was a failure. Many people will question the truth of this judgment. It is highly probable that Wilson, not in the way he expected, perhaps, rescued Princeton from certain unbeneficial practices and helped both by his ideals and his standards of excellence to establish it in the noble educational career it has since pursued. If so, how in the larger view can his Princeton presidency be declared a failure? And why Wilson's gubernatorial experience should be considered a failure rather than an exemplary success is hard to see. As to the future estimate of the outcome of Wilson's career as president of the United States, one would beseech this young man to strive to be dispassionately just and to view the issues broadly. One would hate to see a good man and a great patriot, rather than his political opponents, made responsible for the Second World War. It is, the author will find, much nobler and much more distinguished to seek truth dispassionately than to follow the lines of partisanship. Perhaps he will remember that fate and not failure prevented Wilson from carrying the country with him in his effort to get his country to do its duty by the world. For example, if the radio had become a practical device a few months earlier, Wilson, with his unequaled powers of persuasion, would almost certainly have rallied the American people to his support, and the cosmic catastrophe at Pueblo might have been averted.

HARDIN CRAIG,
University of Missouri

ADLAI E. STEVENSON OF ILLINOIS. By Noel F. Busch. New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1952; pp. 236. $3.75.

This readable portrait is not meant to be an extensive biography. It presents a sketch of the Governor's life, personality, and ancestry, some observations of current political interest, and an appendix containing two of Stevenson's speeches, some of his veto messages, answers to newsmen's questions, and similar materials. The second printing of the book has added the text of his speech accepting the Democratic nomination for President.

The author gives some attention to Stevenson's speaking, calls him "not merely a good after-dinner speaker but easily the best all-around political orator to appear on the U. S. scene since F. D. R.," and praises him for being able to write his own speeches. The Governor developed proficiency, according to Busch, by "long and diligent practice" before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. Busch feels that Stevenson's "unusual ability as a speaker" has been one of his principal assets.

This book offers some help as background material to critics who will want to analyze Stevenson's speeches in the presidential campaign and later. This man from Illinois deserves close scrutiny as a speaker, and critics will be eager to have much more detail than is here; but the Busch portrait will serve as an introduction to the latest man to join the list of distinguished subjects for rhetorical study.

HALBERT E. GULLEY,
University of Illinois

THE AGE OF DANGER: MAJOR SPEECHES ON AMERICAN PROBLEMS. Edited by Harold F. Harding. New York: Random House, 1952; pp. xiv+561. $2.45.

Except for Baird's annual volume of *Representative American Speeches*, these addresses, as edited by Professor Harding, form the only collection of recent speeches to appear in several years. Moreover, it is difficult to cite any editor who has brought within the covers of one volume so many extended speeches by so many individuals of this modern age.

This is a serious book. Harding says: "The sixty-odd addresses and discussions included here are intended as subject matter for present-day students." Samples of light and entertaining speeches are not a part of it.

Space does not permit even a cursory review of the sixty-eight included out of the "more than a thousand . . . considered. . . ." Those finally selected have been delivered since Churchill's Fulton, Missouri, speech. The "timeliness and content" of Churchill, Toynbee, Acheson, Truman, MacArthur, Dulles, Eisenhower, Conant, Compton, Hutchins, Griswold, Bunche, and many others have been brought together. The speeches have been classified under three major divisions: "The World Outlook in the Atomic Age"; "The United States and Foreign Affairs"; "The United States and Home Affairs."

This is a book to be used. Courses in discussion and public speaking, for example, can be enriched by the teacher who will direct his students to it. We are, indeed, indebted to Professor Harding.

DALLAS C. DICKEY,
University of Florida

CRITICS AND CRITICISM, ANCIENT AND MODERN. By R. S. Crane, W. R. Keast, Richard McKeon, Norman Maclean, Elder Olson, Bernard Weinberg. Edited with an Introduction by R. S. Crane. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952; pp. 647. $6.00.

The book is a collection of miscellaneous studies unified by general assumptions and aims with respect to criticism. For the critics represented, the problem of literary criticism is inseparable from the much larger problem of how the humanities in general might be brought to play a more influential role in the culture and action of the contemporary world. The first effort, accordingly, has been to explore the possibility of a general critique of literary criticism (defined as any reasoned and systematic discourse about the poetic arts and their products) such as might yield objective criteria for interpreting the diversities and oppositions among critics and for judging the comparative merits of rival critical schools. The second major concern is with the capacities for modern development and use of one such critical system—the poetic method of Aristotle.

The book is arranged in three sections, the first dealing primarily with representative critics of the present day, the second with figures and episodes in the history of criticism from the Greeks through the 18th century, and the third with theoretical questions relating to the criticism of criticism and of poetic forms.

Of the twenty essays printed, fourteen are reprints of articles previously published. The volume contains reprints of such well-known essays as Richard McKeon's "Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity," "Aristotle's Conception of Language and the Arts of Language," "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," "Poetry and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century: The Renaissance of Rhetoric," and such excellent essays as Elder Olson's "The Argument of Longinus' *On the Sublime*" and Bernard Weinberg's "Robertello on the *Poetics*."

This is an invaluable collection of essays both for the critic of the instrumental art of rhetoric and for the critic of the fine arts.

MARIE HOCHMUTH,
University of Illinois

THE GREAT PHILOSOPHERS: THE WESTERN WORLD. By E. W. F. Tomlin. New York: A. A. Wyn, Inc., 1952; pp. 282. $3.00.

This book briefly treats Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, Peter Abelard, St. Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche, and Bergson. Alfred North Whitehead might well have been added.

Effort is made to combine biography and philosophy "in a way best calculated to illumine both." By the aid of "interludes" between these individual treatments, the author would link together these periods and thinkers, to present "one continuous life"—that of the Western World. The thesis of the volume is that great philosophers are "a kind of keeper of public consciousness" and that these great philosophers are the chief sustainers of that knowledge "without which our whole civilized life would disintegrate in a short time." The writer is interested in "restoring philosophy to its true vocation."

The book is scholarly. The style is lucid but uninspired. For students of rhetoric the work

is a highly condensed review of philosophy. Students of Aristotle and of his successors who have influenced rhetoric will turn elsewhere for more complete and searching analyses of the philosophies that have directly or indirectly affected "great" rhetoricians and "great" orators.

A. Craig Baird,
State University of Iowa

TORCHBEARER OF FREEDOM: THE INFLUENCE OF RICHARD PRICE ON 18th CENTURY THOUGHT. By Carl B. Cone. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1952; pp. 209. $3.75.

Now that this new biography has appeared, no longer should Richard Price be known, when he is known at all, only as the preacher of the sermon which set off Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. For better or for worse, that itself is no trivial distinction; but Price enjoyed a wide reputation and exerted a strong force on affairs long before that event. Though no pulpit orator, he was a dissenting clergyman whose strong and benevolent influence led him to be known among his contemporaries generally as "the good Dr. Price." "His delivery," writes Professor Cone, "was awkward, his voice unpleasant"; yet "his strength of character and the thoughtfulness of his sermons . . . won him success as a minister." Price, therefore, illustrates Campbell's and Blair's judgment of the strongest mode of persuasion available to the preacher. Besides being a considerable moralist and philosopher in both the pulpit and the study, Price was one of the most ardent apostles of civil and political liberty. His *Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty* was "the most famous British Tract on the American war," and he later contributed much welcome advice to the devisers of the American nation and the Constitution. In quite another area Price contributed theoretically and controversially to statistics and finance, especially in the actuarial phases of insurance, the public debt, and the sinking fund. In the Shelburne circle, which included another more famous Dissenter, Joseph Priestley, Price was the confidant and adviser of statesmen, an idea-man for two prime ministers—Shelburne and the younger Pitt.

The title of this handsome example of bookmaking points up the strongly rhetorical factor in Price's significance. Fortunate indeed is it, therefore, that he has been raised from neglect by an historian who recognizes in public address not merely a record of thought but also an important operative force to be reckoned into any fully significant analysis of political or social movements.

Donald C. Bryant,
Washington University

SPEECH: ITS TECHNIQUES AND DISCIPLINES IN A FREE SOCIETY. By William Norwood Brigance. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952; pp. xix+582. $4.00.

Believing "that the system of speechmaking was born of man's early struggle for democracy, that it is still inherent in a free society, that it is a dangerous form of power requiring a sense of high responsibility by those who use it," Professor Brigance writes with an eloquence rare in a textbook. Believing that the most effective speeches of history have been "prepared in accordance with a theory of public address," Professor Brigance analyzes a theory for this generation with a precision almost equally rare.

In addition to foreword, appendix of four speeches, and index, the book has 24 chapters divided into six headings. "Part I, Getting Started" is a textbook in capsular form. Then come "The Audience," "The Speech," "The Speaker," "Occasions and Forms." Part VI, "Dynamic Persuasion in an Industrial Democracy," argues that the creative minority (too often seemingly equated with management) must direct growth in our civilization by persuading the masses.

Professor Brigance is a master of sharp exemplification from history, of painstaking illustration of precept, of prose characterized by jabbing declarative sentences. He salts his pages with aphorisms: "To err is human; but to listeners it is infuriating" (8); "The verb is a motor. It propels the sentence." (311) He repeats his celebrated maxim (the first half of which I consider dubious doctrine): "Written language must be ultimately intelligible to the reader. Spoken language must be *instantly* intelligible to the listener." (307) He proudly believes that public address is a liberal art; he has created a book that will be appreciated by the liberal minded, instructor and undergraduate alike.

Frederick W. Haberman,
University of Wisconsin

ESSENTIALS OF GENERAL SPEECH. By A. Craig Baird and Franklin H. Knower. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952; pp. vii+253. $3.00.

Baird and Knower have presented the essential portions of their basic text, *General Speech*, in a brief edition

Many chapters are unchanged, and the splendid exercises are almost intact. Some chapters have been combined. "Improving of Speech Habits" and "Beginner's Problems" are now together. The two chapters on "Ideas" have been shortened into one, as have the three on organization.

The chapter on "Voice," formerly treated as physical attributes of speech, has become "things to do" in improving voice. Two chapters on listening have been re-written into a single treatment, composed of analysis of the audience as listeners, followed by advice to the auditor.

Two chapters, "The Speaker's Personality" and "Radio Speaking," have been omitted altogether. Some excellent features of the basic text have also been cut, such as references at the ends of chapters, the "nervousness questionnaire," the "listening inventory," the "oral reading test," and the pronunciation word list. However, if the instructor has the basic text, the material is available. As a matter of preference, the material in a form separate from the text is often desired.

Two new chapters have been added: "Speaking for Interest and Entertainment" (including two paragraphs on story-telling) and "Speaking for Special Occasions."

The teacher of a course in "general speech education," for whom the authors say they prepared the book, will have in the hands of his students one of the finest texts in the field.

DON STREETER,
Memphis State College

HOW TO TALK WITH PEOPLE. By Irving J. Lee. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952; pp. xiii+176. $2.00.

The sub-title, "A Program for Preventing Troubles That Come When People Talk Together," suggests the general purpose of this book. The jacket superscript, "A Guide for the Improvement of Communication in Committees," adds that this is a report on a study of the communication of small groups. The suggestions, however, are applicable to any communication in which misunderstanding and conflict arise. An equally appropriate title might have been "The Psychology of Communication in Human Relations." It is in many ways a general semantics brought down from some of its common high level abstractions and applied to problem cases of communication in language which is meaningful and stimulating.

"The program" is based on conclusions reached from the searching and objective observation of over 200 groups at work on the solution of their real problems. Professor Lee does not trouble the reader with extensive details, but distills from his experiences an analysis of the treatment of barriers which thwart effective communication. This empirical approach to the problem has proved useful and stimulating. The suggestions are presented because they *worked* where tried. The method lends itself to a creative approach to other difficulties. Many of his principles could well serve as hypotheses for more rigorous experimental testing.

The program is offered with modesty and discrimination. The style is simple, clear, and interesting. This book will reward the reader looking for something new and practical on this difficult subject.

FRANKLIN H. KNOWER,
Ohio State University

POETRY AS EXPERIENCE. By Norman C. Stageberg and Wallace L. Anderson. New York: American Book Company, 1952; pp. xxiii+515. $3.25.

Although *Poetry as Experience* is designed as a textbook for a literature course, it will be invaluable to teachers and students of oral interpretation. Poetry is treated as a lively, aesthetic experience: "When we read a poem something happens to us. The words on the page bring to life a group of images, feelings, and thoughts. . . . This response within us—the experience caused by the words—is the poem." We agree with the authors right from the beginning.

The book is divided into two parts: the essentials of poetry and poems for study. The first part treats imagery, rhythm, sound symbolism and other elements of the poet's craft and gives many poems to illustrate the textual material. The second part is as representative an anthology as can be found; it begins with the folk ballad and extends to Dylan Thomas and Richard Wilbur.

The discussion of sound symbolism in poetry will be of special interest to the speech teacher. Sounds are divided into three groups: speech sounds which imitate actual sounds, speech sounds which have been arranged so that they are either difficult or easy to articulate, and sounds which themselves suggest meaning—"phonetic intensives." Credit for many of the ideas is given to such linguists as Sapir, Bloomfield, and Jespersen. Another chapter that will be very useful to the teacher of oral interpre-

tation is the one on rhythm. The authors do a fine job of defining it and explaining how it must be controlled in oral reading. "There must be a compromise," they say, "between the regular stresses of the subjective meter and the stresses needed to make clear the sense of the words."

Perhaps for the class restricted to the study of poetry, *Poetry as Experience* could be used as a textbook, but it will probably be more popular as a supplementary book on the reserve shelf. It is worthy of the consideration of all who are interested in poetry.

MARGARET ROBB,
University of Colorado

READING PROSE: AN INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL STUDY. By Wright Thomas and Stuart Gerry Brown. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952; pp. xiii+703. $4.00.

This book contains a collection of prose writings of many types on many subjects, arranged in sections according to purpose, thought, or feeling. The selections were chosen in the hope of developing in students the ability to understand and enjoy varied types of literature of merit. In the preface, the authors state that the first three parts "are arranged in an order designed to develop a variety of reading skills, moving in general from the more simple to the more complex." The other eight sections show no such plan.

Guidance for the study of each selection is supplied by the usual methods of critical and explanatory comment, thought-provoking questions, and suggested comparisons. More general guidance is supplied in the final section of the book, which includes an example of literary analysis; a discussion of the types of prose structure, as the authors have identified them; a brief discussion of diction, sentence structure, and figures of speech; and a very brief paragraph on style.

HARRIETT IDOL,
Louisiana State University

PLAY PRODUCTION: THEORY AND PRACTICE. By Barnard Hewitt, J. F. Foster, and Muriel Sibell Wolle. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1952; pp. viii+488. $5.00.

With no intention of being bromidic in order to stimulate interest in *Play Production: Theory and Practice* the critic may say this book is needed. That a considerable number of various treatments of the subject have appeared in handbooks, texts, and student outlines is common knowledge. Professor Hewitt himself wrote an excellent text, *The Art and Craft of Play Production,* upon which this book is based in part. The important contribution of the new work by Professors Hewitt and Wolle and Technical Director J. F. Foster is its comprehensive coverage of a vast amount of material relative to the problems and definitions of play production. The book covers such subjects as the fundamentals of the written play, its communication to the audience, problems of setting, lighting, and sound, the actor, and problems of costume and makeup. Theory and practice both are given satisfactory and simple treatment. *Simple* is used advisedly, because one of the chief merits of the book is the simplicity of presentation and, for the most part, the clear statement of the multitudinous problems of play production for students in elementary theatre courses.

The desire for clarity, however, creates a particular problem in that statements become extremely general. At times assertions, over-simplified, do not completely express the probable meaning of the authors. Yet it must be remembered that this work is for the beginning student to whom the problems of theatre production are totally new. In the early sections of the book many points are in need of more elaboration, particularly in the discussions of plot, tragedy, catharsis, and so forth.

A confusion also exists in the organization of the book. In part this is the result of a plethora of subheadings, often in a variety of type. Although the authors attempt in the earlier chapters to prepare the reader with sufficient definitions to make clear the materials discussed in subsequent chapters, the subjects are not as clearly referable as they should be, and often the emphasis appears to be out of proportion to the content. No one chapter may be singled out for this confusion, since all suffer from it.

The book touches on many and varied phases of play production. It is valuable from this point of view. In many ways it is a remarkable compendium of material for the elementary student. Its new contributions lie in the chapters on theatre art and the audience. In these chapters the theatre student is made aware of the aesthetics of the theatre, the nature of the audience, and the relation of each to the other. These observations should certainly be made at the elementary level, and it is hoped that the necessarily brief introduction to these problems will stimulate theatre students, beginning as well as mature, to investigate them more

thoroughly. The chapter on scene design is also excellent; although at times Mr. Foster is somewhat confused in semantic difficulties and definition, for the most part the chapter is interesting and extremely useful. The section on acting, which contains four meaty chapters, is frequently a restatement of basic principles; but these statements are necessary, and the work would be incomplete without them.

Each chapter lists important bibliographies as well as a series of questions and exercises which are extremely helpful to the teacher and student. Thus *Play Production* serves as an important and useful book for the beginning student and the teacher of elementary courses. It has also the added virtue of being thought-provoking and stimulating. Theory and practice clearly support each other, and the reader is made conscious that they are not isolated but work together for the benefit of the artists of the theatre and the audience for whom the play is presented.

NORMAN PHILBRICK,
Stanford University

DRAMA: ITS COSTUME AND DECOR. By James Laver. New York: Studio Publications, 1951; pp. xii+276. $5.75.

James Laver has been in the Department of Engraving, Illustration, and Design of the Victoria and Albert Museum in London for thirty years and is now the Keeper of the department. This book developed out of the author's extensive study of the theatre material included in the collection and is illustrated largely with reproductions of drawings, prints, and engravings from it. One of his reasons for preparing the book was to acquaint theatre scholars with the nature and extent of the collection. The book is a brief history of the development of the theatrical arts of costume and staging in Europe. Brevity is its chief weakness. The merit of Mr. Laver's work is primarily in the exposition of the period from the early Renaissance to 1850. Here he introduces several previously neglected designers, notable Buontalente, Juvarra, and Sir James Thornhill. Several designs by the latter, presumably for a production at Drury Lane Theatre, are of special interest, since they give a clue to the nature of stage settings around 1700 and fill in part of the gap in the documentation of this period.

LEWIS G. MCFARLAND,
Northern Illinois State Teachers College

THE NATURE OF ROMAN COMEDY: A STUDY IN POPULAR ENTERTAINMENT. By George E. Duckworth. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952; pp. xiii-501. $7.50.

Professor Duckworth's treatment of Roman Comedy, exhaustive and discriminating, presents the fruits not only of his own distinguished work, but of the many other important contributors to our total knowledge of the classics as well. The book deals first with what is known of the beginnings of Roman Comedy in the Italian popular comedy and the Greek New Comedy. Then Professor Duckworth takes up in great detail the work of Plautus and Terence, the stages upon which their plays were given, the conditions of presentation, stage conventions and techniques, and the content and form of the plays. The final chapter deals with the influences of Plautus and Terence on later playwrights. A good bibliography and an unusually thorough index complete the volume.

Those interested in the drama are indeed grateful for the careful scholarship, rich knowledge of the subject, keen insights, and the clear readable style with which Professor Duckworth has invested the book. As a source of information for the director in the theatre, the book is invaluable. As a definitive work in a field about which our information is too often scattered and unorganized, this book will fill a need among students of the classic drama.

HAROLD CRAIN,
State University of Iowa

BERNARD SHAW: A CHRONICLE. By R. F. Rattray. New York: Roy Publishers, 1951; pp. 347. $5.00.

BERNARD SHAW. By A. C. Ward. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1951; pp. 215. $1.85.

R. F. Rattray's *Bernard Shaw: A Chronicle* is aptly and accurately titled. Its author notes it as "uniquely useful in that it gives a detailed account of [Shaw's] life in *chronological order*, with consequent ease of reference." The combination of chronicle method with an undeniably pedestrian style does not make for reading pleasure, but the book manages, by eschewing almost entirely personal critical judgments, to compress into slightly over 300 pages all of the factual data contained in the two Henderson biographies and in Pearson's *Portrait* and to bring these data down to the time of Shaw's death.

Bernard Shaw: A Chronicle is an extension and a revision of a volume of the same title published in 1934. I originally noted that

edition as indispensable to the Shavian researcher, particularly the American Shavian, because of Rattray's inclusion among his generous quotations from other writers of many otherwise fairly unobtainable items for that student. The present edition is even more valuable in this respect. The appendix-inclusion of some twenty-four pages of casual and scattered quotes from Shaw's criticism seems unwarranted. One correction: *Our Theatres in the Nineties* is not a selection from but a full collection of Shaw's dramatic criticism.

Recently in these columns I highly praised a pamphlet by A. C. Ward, which appeared shortly before Shaw's death. Ward has expanded his treatment into a small but illuminating book. Unlike R. F. Rattray, Ward is specifically interested in the criticism of the plays and in a brief assessment of Shaw as critic. And he himself is an extremely decisive and perceptive critic, with the sense to argue wisely and well against such standard fallacies of Shavian criticism as that Shaw's plays are not really plays and that his characters are really only mouthpiece-puppets for the dramatist. He shows throughout full realization of his subject as prose-stylist and verbal magician-musician. In his analyses of the separate plays, he quite rightly devotes most attention to *Man and Superman* (especially the dream scene), *Heartbreak House* and *Saint Joan*, although he is singularly acute in his appreciation of such trifles as *Village Wooing*. Granting its lesser scope, since Ward shows little interest in Shaw as philosopher, I know of no book its size with which to compare this except Eric Bentley's brilliant little volume. And that is very high praise.

E. J. West,
University of Colorado

THEATRE AND ALLIED ARTS: A GUIDE TO BOOKS DEALING WITH THE HISTORY, CRITICISM, AND TECHNIC OF THE DRAMA AND THEATRE AND RELATED ARTS AND CRAFTS. By Blanche M. Baker. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1952; pp. xiii+536. $10.00.

THE THEATRE DICTIONARY: BRITISH AND AMERICAN TERMS IN THE DRAMA, OPERA, AND BALLET. By Wilfred Granville. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952; pp. ix+227. $5.00.

Both books will be a joy to the librarian, and basic reference books for the student and general reader, though for any specialized research they would be only starters.

The new edition of the Baker bibliography, bringing it up to 1948, has all the virtues and all the weaknesses of the usual card catalogue. It lumps together without discrimination all the books available on each large topic. Yet because it is such a catch-all, it will include many items a more specialized list might miss. Short descriptions give useful hints of the quality and scope of each book. A section of "additional material" with each subject gives an amazing number of references to parts of other books.

The *Theater Dictionary* is a delight to read, rich in theatrical slang, back-stage jargon, and traditional lore. It contains only a few technical terms of lighting or setting, or of opera and ballet. Though it purports to cover British and American terms, it is still a book about English usage with a few American equivalents added.

George R. Kernodle,
University of Arkansas

THE AGE OF PIRANDELLO. By Lander MacClintock. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1952; pp. 341. $5.00.

To a theatre director who thinks the modern Italian theatre existed only in the works of Pirandello, D'Annunzio, Giacosa, and Bennelli, *The Age of Pirandello* is a revelation. For when one has completed this scholarly appraisal of the Italian verists, the dialect theatre, and the many proponents of an anti-realistic, anti-slice-of-life theatre, such as the *grotteschi*, the *crepusculari*, and the futurists who held the stage from 1910 to 1940 along with the great Sicilian, one realizes that an almost undetected void has existed in the critical literature of the modern European theatre.

Professor MacClintock has directed his analysis to the question, *"Esiste un teatro italiano?"* (Is there an Italian theatre?) The answer which he propounds after exhaustive and objective study is, "From the point of view of technique of the drama we can answer in the affirmative, from the spiritual point of view we must reply in the negative." The tendency of Italian playwrights to adopt the prevailing fashion in the theatre and their failure to reflect the life of the people (a failing not unknown in other countries) militates against a completely affirmative answer to the root question of the book.

Luigi Pirandello himself cannot be accused of artistic insincerity. As the author points out:

"He remained consistently faithful throughout all his vast production to his original and fundamental idea of the drama." The chapter entitled "Pirandello, the Perfect Pessimist" is an excellent evaluation of the Nobel prize winner and author of *Six Characters in Search of an Author*. It in itself makes this study valuable. The author is not guilty of critical idolatry, as one might suspect from the title. For he is quick to point out, of Pirandello's stage directions, for example, "The detailed descriptions are at best superfluous for the actor, at worst a handicap," and of his sentimental and romantic attitude toward motherhood, "After all, there is nothing astonishing and certainly nothing mysterious about a woman's having a child. . . ."

Valuable also for the student of the theatre are chapter nine, "Cinema" and chapter ten, "Theatre Business." These indicate that the author sees the drama or at least the theatre in the broader sense of the word and that he is not unmindful of the fact that plays are written to be acted.

In certain of the earlier chapters Professor MacClintock has succumbed to what he himself calls "The critic's pitfall," too many and too frequent summaries of plots—summaries which at best can only suggest the quality of the play. Further, the liberal use of Italian, French, and German, not to mention the numerous Italian titles (which occasionally are not translated) might prevent the reader, unless he be multilingual, from getting the full flavor of what the jacket of the book boasts "is the only complete study in *English* [the italics are mine] of this fascinating period."

THOMAS D. PAWLEY,
Lincoln University (Missouri)

CHECKHOV THE DRAMATIST. By David Magarshack. New York: Auvergne Publishers, 1952; pp. 301. $4.50.

Of the many attempts on the part of dramatic and literary critics to explain Checkhov to the general public, this in the judgment of the reviewer is the best. In the introduction the author briefly but pointedly reviews some of the principal difficulties Checkhov experienced when his plays were staged. According to Checkhov, all he wanted to say to the public in his plays was: "Have a look at yourselves and see how bad and dreary your lives are." He stoutly protested the interpretative treatment of his plays by the Moscow Art Theatre. He accused Stanislavsky of making his characters into cry-babies. Tolstoy, the foremost Russian writer of his day, dismissed Checkhov's *The Sea Gull* as "nonsense," and as "utterly worthless." Desmond MacCarthy accused Checkhov of "the absence of a well-defined aim in his plays," and complained of the general ineffectuality of his characterizations. Magarshack gives an interpretative evaluation of the contribution of Checkhov as a playwright. In making the evaluation he shows no tendency to extoll or to blame. He makes a number of fundamental observations, and uses the text of the plays to illustrate his points.

The second part deals with plays of direct action; the third part deals with the valid reasons which prompted Checkhov to make the transition between plays of direct action and those of indirect action; the fourth and last part deals with plays of indirect action. The author points out that the transition is not concerned mainly with physical action itself, but rather with the fact that the plays of indirect action produce a tremendous impact on the audience. The principal contrast between Checkhov's early plays and his later ones is that in the former the dialogue is mainly dramatic, but in the latter it is mainly evocative or poetic. Also, in the plays of indirect action, great force lies in the presence of "invisible" characters.

The last chapter in Part Four deals with *The Cherry Orchard*. It is indeed regrettable that this chapter could not have been read by Messrs. Logan and Hayward before their presentation of *The Wisteria Trees*, for the author reaffirms that the sale of the Cherry Orchard does not form a main theme of the play; that the symbolism has nothing to do with its sale. All the play is supposed to do, according to Checkhov, is to show "the destruction of beauty by those who are utterly blind to it." This is the recurrent theme in many of his plays. Checkhov experienced physical, emotional, and mental anguish upon receiving Stanislavsky's letter classifying the play as a Tragedy and not a Comedy. We can be grateful that through a benevolent death Checkhov was spared the strangling symbolism of *The Wisteria Trees* à la Logan and Hayward.

The public is fortunate in having in this book one brilliant Russian writer analyzing the contribution of one of the greatest Russian minds of the past hundred years. Magarshack has written a number of studies on the Russian stage and drama, including a full-length biography of Constantine Stanislavsky. *Checkhov the*

Dramatist is a definite contribution to the field of dramatic literature.

LEE NORVELLE,
Indiana University

SOPHOCLES THE DRAMATIST. By A. J. A. Waldock. New York: Cambridge University Press, American Branch. 1951; pp. viii+234. $3.25.

This book is divided into two parts; the first deals with critical canons. Here the author discusses the historical method and its limitations. He at no time denies the importance of the historical method, but points out with convincing clarity that many writers rely too heavily upon it. He attacks with strong logic the documentary fallacy, and illustrates his point with passages from Hamlet. He follows with a discussion of pattern-making, and attacks the Bradleian-Hegelian system. The last chapter of the first part is devoted to the Aristotelian Dictum: Catharsis. Here he applies the chief rule in reading the *Poetics*, "to look carefully before and after and then to check the meaning of a sentence by what seems to be its background of thought."

The second half of the book deals with the following Greek plays: The *Ajax;* The *Trachiniae;* The *Antigone;* The *Oedipus Tyrannus;* The *Electra;* The *Philoctetes;* and The *Oedipus Colonus.* He points out that one of the most insistent problems was unity and concludes: "Any distraction in a drama is bad, and anything that does not minister to a drama is distraction."

The reader will find the book highly controversial. The author attacks the fallacies and ineptitudes of critics who concern themselves with the *study* of drama rather than with drama as *staged.* He points out that modern critics lose sight of the plays as dramatic inventions, and search instead for meanings. The book, in short, is an indictment of all who handle the plays of Sophocles as historical documents. The style is clear and swift. Many will not agree with the conclusions of the author, but all who read it, and there should be many, will be stimulated by it.

LEE NORVELLE,
Indiana University

TELEVISION WRITING: THEORY AND TECHNIQUE. By Robert S. Greene. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952; pp. x+276. $3.75.

The avowed purpose of this book is to provide techniques and principles of writing for television. The author says, "It is strictly a book on writing; problems of television production are discussed only when they directly affect the writer." Following this premise, which the author sets for himself, the first three short chapters deal with the production elements which the prospective television writer should know about if he is going to write a script for the new medium of communication. The remaining sixteen chapters of the book are concerned with writing techniques such as script format and the handling of dialogue, flashbacks, transitions, the opening scene, etc. Special attention is also given to methods of handling adaptations to be used on TV.

The chapter on "Visual Writing" is an especially interesting treatment as to how television writing differs from other forms of writing. Mr. Greene gives suggestions concerning the division of the burden of communication between the audio and the video. He points out that through close-up camera shots the fine nuances of acting, such as facial expressions, are revealed to the television viewer much more than to the theatre-goer. In other words, in TV one "writes" with the camera.

The book is well written and well organized; it proceeds logically from chapter to chapter. As Robert Montgomery writes in the foreword, the book should be well received by both the professional writer and the student of writing. Most colleges, however, have not developed their television curriculums to the point of specialization where unit courses are offered in television writing. For schools that offer courses in television writing Greene's book could very well serve as a basic text, and any television production course at the college level could well use it as a reference book.

HAROLD E. NELSON,
Pennsylvania State College

FUNDAMENTALS OF RADIO COMMUNICATIONS. By Abraham Sheingold. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1951; pp. 442. $5.25.

The text is designed to introduce the student with a non-technical background to the electronic fundamentals of radio communication. Since almost the entire field of radio communications from basic circuit concepts to complex radar systems is encompassed, the treatment is necessarily non-rigorous and lacking in the mathematical and illustrative detail encountered in the many standard engineering texts required to cover the overall communications art. However, the lack of comprehensive

detail permits the non-specialist with some interest in communications engineering to obtain an overall picture of the field; such a broad view should be a valuable aid and stimulus to further studies.

As the title signifies, the coverage is confined to the radio aspect of the communications field. A brief discussion of the audio and electro-acoustic phases of communication would have been a valuable complement to an introductory text in radio communications.

MARTIN E. DEMPSEY,
Purdue University

CONTENT ANALYSIS IN COMMUNICATION RESEARCH. By Bernard Berelson. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1952; pp. 220. $3.50.

By the use of content analysis techniques, Rudolph Arnheim exposed the psychological dimensions of the content of soap operas (See Lazarsfeld and Stanton, *Radio Research, 1942-1943*, New York, 1944, pp. 34-85). Combining these data with those derived from the symbolic analysis of audience identifications by Warner and Henry ("The Radio Daytime Serial, A Symbolic Analysis," *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, volume 37, pp. 3-71), one can arrive at some notion of the phenomena involved in a particular communication process. So complex are such processes that it is generally expedient thus to divide the research problem into the two aspects, content and audience effects.

Content analysis as a research tool is probably most widely known for its application to political communication, particularly to news materials. But its techniques are applicable to a wide range of communications, indeed, to every sort of communication about which one wishes to say more than can be said on the basis of ordinary reading, listening, or watching. Analyses have been made of interviews, gestures, maps, and projective drawings as well as of the press, radio, film, and television. Often content analyses are made as incidentals to other studies, and not infrequently the investigator is unaware of the considerable body of theoretical and prescriptive literature which has grown up about the use of the technique.

Berelson's book, which is the outgrowth of a mimeographed draft issued jointly with Paul Lazarsfeld at Columbia University in 1948, makes generally available for the first time a comprehensive status-survey of the whole field of content analysis. As such, it is an invaluable addition to the methodological armory of a variety of scholars. It is of particular interest to students of mass communication, for the sheer quantity of mass media materials requires special techniques for sampling and quantifying. But context analysis is also valuable to students in many other fields, e.g., history, political science, sociology, and clinical psychology. Whenever an investigator wishes to make objective statements about what a given body of communicative materials "says" or "means," he is likely to find content analysis techniques helpful.

Berelson lists about 280 published content analysis studies. He has categorized them as to purpose into eighteen classes, such as "to study the development of scholarship," "to discover stylistic features," "to secure political and military intelligence," "to facilitate research operations." Although the studies date back to the turn of the century, the field has expanded most rapidly since World War II, which greatly stimulated the use of content analysis for political and military purposes.

Arrangement of the bibliography in terms of the several uses of content analysis is handy for some purposes, but it becomes a disadvantage in the absence of any general index, either of authors or subject matter. It is to be hoped that this deficiency will be corrected in any future editions.

SYDNEY W. HEAD,
University of Miami

TOWARD A GENERAL THEORY OF ACTION. Edited by Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, pp. viii+496. $7.50.

Science develops from the interplay of findings from controlled experiments with statements of theory. Science grows in a particular area with the ability to make precise descriptions, to categorize with qualifications, and to generalize within limits. In this book several leading psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists have cooperated in building "a theory of action," or a "conceptual scheme for the analysis of the behavior of living organisms." In other words, this book points toward a science of human behavior and sets up a great deal of the scaffolding which the authors think will sustain such a science.

Action is classified thoroughly from aspects of culture, personality, and social systems. The theory of action involves actors, a situation of action, and the orientation of the actor to the situation. There is motivational orientation and value-orientation. There are orientations to: (1) discriminated and related objects, (2)

goals, (3) gratification-deprivation, and (4) standards of acceptability. There are three modes of motivational orientation: (1) the cognitive or knowing, (2) the cathetic (like or dislike of an object) and (3) evaluative. There are two modes of value-orientation which is the overall organizing principle of action: (1) by narrowing the range of alternatives, (2) by amplifying the consequences of the various alternatives. Interwoven with these are appreciative and moral value standards. Action has three basic types: (1) intellectual activity, (2) expressive action, (3) responsible or moral action.

An actor in a situation is confronted by a series of major dilemmas of orientation, a series of choices that he must make before the situation has a determinate meaning for him: (1) whether or not evaluation is to take place in the given situation, (2) the primacy of moral standards in the situation, (3) the nature of the objects for their qualities as contrasted with what they do, (5) what the object means in terms of something particular as contrasted with things in general.

This book varies greatly in its readability. Although much of it is clearly written, the following is a sample of the communicating which occasionally jams the lines: "A behavior space is thus to be defined as a particularized complex of perceptions (memories and inferences) as to objects and relations and the behaving self, evoked by the given environmental stimulus situation and by a controlling and activated belief-value matrix (or perhaps several such matrices)."

The book is recommended as a reference in an advanced seminar on speech or communication theory.

ELWOOD MURRAY,
University of Denver

PUBLIC RELATIONS. By Edward L. Bernays. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1952; pp. vii+374. $5.00.

The profession of public relations counselor suggested by this author is far more than that of trouble-shooter for the president of a corporation or white-washer of a scandal in the operation of an enterprise. Public relations, in part, is "society's solution to the problems of maladjustment that plague our complex world." This volume deals with the coordinated use of the various methods and media of communication to bring about the "social integration" necessary to relieve the problem concerned. Emphasis is placed on the use of social science research in the "engineering of consent."

Public relations is defined as (1) information given the public, (2) persuasion directed to the public to modify attitudes and actions, (3) efforts to integrate attitudes and actions with the public. In the first part of the book Mr. Bernays presents an excellent history of public relations and the methods of persuasion which began with the invention of writing and continues through all the history of the ancient tyrants, the dark ages, and the modern world. He gives particular attention to the eras of "the Public Be Damned" and "the Public Be Informed" in the United States which led to the rise of this new profession and the vast importance of its work in many enterprises today. In our present interdependent culture only those enterprises which are able to integrate themselves with their publics can survive. Modern business and industrial enterprises as operated in America must be more effective in their public relations or the public will look to more and more government to provide them services and solve their problems.

The second part of the book shows the application of the methods and philosophy of public relations to specific enterprises and professions. Although the author makes much use of public opinion polls and surveys of attitudes, he is especially concerned with the deeper levels of personality and the hidden motivations. In his use of depth interviews, his new methods of sampling public opinion, his incisive and broad analyses and interpretations he offers much which is both helpful and inspiring to leaders of enterprises which have bogged down.

Much in this volume is important directly to teachers of speech and communication. Speech, public speaking, and theatre are treated in their total setting as coordinate with other media and methods. One of the author's clients was the League of New York Theatres, Inc., an association of theatre producers who asked him to make a survey and recommendations to meet the crises in theatre attendance in 1949. The recommendations he made are important for the whole area of theatre arts, professions, and education.

In addition to suggestions for the improvement of public relations, for public education, and for higher education programs are outlined for Anglo-American Cooperation, for aids to ethnic harmony in Hawaii, for better labor-management relations, and for methods whereby business can sell the American Way of Life to the American people.

ELWOOD MURRAY,
University of Denver

JANE WALKER'S BOOK OF ART LECTURES FOR LIP READING PRACTICE. By Jane B. Walker Memorial. Washington, D. C.: The Volta Review, 1951; pp. 61. $3.12.

This book contains a series of twelve art lectures based on the manuscripts and notes of Jane B. Walker. Miss Walker headed regular art classes of speechreading groups at the Metropolitan Museum of Art for thirty years. After her death the Sanzoray Club, New York, organized in 1923 for the deaf and deafened, took on the task of editing and publishing the material.

The lectures are divided into three parts: Part I deals with Story-telling Pictures; Part II with Animals in Art; Part III with Stories of Great Artists. Each lecture includes suggestions for vocabulary introduction on the blackboard. Information is also included regarding the story of the picture, the picture itself, and the life and artistic characteristics of the painter.

The source material should prove valuable for teachers of the deaf and deafened who are interested in exploring this area with their students. The rather difficult vocabulary might require extensive adaptation and teaching skill. More advanced students might profit from using the book themselves in conjunction with the type of presentation Miss Walker used.

A packet of six prints accompanies the book. Although the inclusion of more illustrative materials was probably not practical, it is to be regretted that no sources are listed for obtaining the numerous slides mentioned. Some information regarding publishers from whom other prints are available at a small cost today would have been useful for the busy teacher who cannot avail herself of the offerings of a metropolitan area. The references in the bibliography are also noticeably incomplete; in some instances they contain only the title of a book.

This book certainly represents a tribute to one who devoted herself to enriching the lives of the aurally handicapped. It should furnish teachers of the deaf with basic suggestions that can be reorganized for particular uses.

JANE BEASLEY,
University of Alabama

BRIEFLY NOTED

UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC OPINION. By Curtis D. MacDougall. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952; pp. xii+698. $5.00.

We do not know of another volume in which are deposited so many examples from press, radio, and public platform of the kinds of stimuli which form the bases for a public opinion. For classes in persuasion, in argumentation, and in experimental public address this well-written and well-documented work constitutes a reference resource of the first order.

Whether you speak from the public platform or from the classroom lecture platform this book contains facts about your audience you ought to know. In revealing how an opinion is formed, this single source brings together materials which will save the audience analyst weeks in the stacks.

ORVILLE PENCE,
University of Washington

HANDBOOK OF PRACTICAL POLITICS. By Paul P. Van Riper. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952; pp. x+214. $1.60.

The author provides a blueprint for the layman interested in participating in political action. The book presents a carefully selected series of quotations from materials prepared by political parties and action groups threaded together with explanatory comments, and should be of considerable reference value to discussion groups and others interested in promoting participation in elections.

ROBERT F. RAY,
State University of Iowa

IN THE BALANCE: SPEECHES 1949 and 1950. By Winston S. Churchill. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952; pp. x+156. $5.00.

This latest volume of Churchill's speeches, again edited by Randolph Churchill, contains fifty-eight addresses, twenty-eight of them delivered in the House of Commons. They include speeches on European unity, the Korean war, and the British general election of February, 1950. Included is his Massachusetts Institute of Technology address on "The Twentieth Century—Its Promise and Its Realization."

HALBERT E. GULLEY,
University of Illinois

SYLLABUS FOR EFFECTIVE SPEECH (Revised Edition). By Gail Plummer. New York: Dryden Press, 1952; pp. 171. $1.45.

This revised work book for training in public speaking has been built by experience over a long period.

The philosophy of public speaking is traditionally sound. The projects are well chosen and well motivated. The critic sheets are wisely designed to give specific help to the student.

Revised features add value to a good book for beginning classes.

ALONZO J. MORLEY,
Brigham Young University

THE SPEAKER'S TREASURY OF ANECDOTES. Edited by Maxwell Droke. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1952; pp. 436. $1.98.

After an excellent introduction in which the compiler advises a speaker as to whether he should tell stories, and how to select and tell them, some thousand anecdotes, classified according to situation, are offered. Following instructions, I have used two of them and met with the promised success.

DON STREETER,
Memphis State College

THREE KEYS TO LANGUAGE. By Robert M. Estrich and Hans Sperber. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1952; pp. x+358. $4.00.

Three Keys to Language stresses the interrelations between language as social behavior and the culture which environs language. It deals with taboo, speech communities, meaning, phonetic and semantic change, humor, style, cultural change, and standards of usage. Treating mainly of familiar ideas, the authors employ a tremendous variety of fresh illustrative material which ranges from Middle High German verse to Brann the Iconoclast. The book is thoughtful, contains perceptive, original observations, and is linguistically sound. It deserves the attention of anyone interested in the socio-historical aspect of language study.

NORMAN C. STAGEBERG,
Iowa State Teachers College

AMERICAN LITERARY CRITICISM, 1900-1950. By Charles J. Glicksberg. New York: Hendricks House, 1951; pp. 574. $4.50.

With Huneker and Trilling his terminals, the anthologist has assembled some twenty-five representative essays by significant American critics of the last half-century. Included, among others, are pieces by Spingarn, Sherman, Calverton, Mumford, More, Blackmur, and Farrell. Brief but telling headnotes provide pertinent biographical matter and criticism of the critics themselves.

LELAND M. GRIFFIN,
Washington University

TIME TO SPEAK UP. By Jessie Haver Butler. (Revised Edition). New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952; pp. xxii+261. $3.00.

Out of wide experience in teaching women to speak more effectively in club work, in civic affairs, and in the activities of public office, Mrs. Butler applies sound advice on the preparation and presentation of speeches to women's interests, and illustrates these principles abundantly from women's speech experiences.

LAURA CROWELL,
University of Washington

SONG AND SPEECH. By George Oscar Bower and Kenneth C. Mook. Boston: Ginn and Company: 1952, pp. x+134. $2.64.

Although the authors indicate that the book can be used to improve speech, the text is primarily devised for use in improving singing. The information and directions about voice and pronunciation are not more clearly nor more accurately stated than in most speech books. The suggestions about posture are good.

F. LINCOLN D. HOLMES,
Illinois State Normal University

THE PAPERS OF SIR WILLIAM JOHNSON, Volume X. Prepared for publication by Milton W. Hamilton. Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1951; pp. xiv+998. $10.00.

This latest volume in the vast collection of primary documents concerning the man who was chiefly responsible for the conduct of relations with the Indians covers the period from September, 1758, through December, 1763, and parallels Volume III and part of Volume V in the same series. Its significance in many phases of pre-Revolutionary history is obvious. Of special interest in the scholarship of public address will be the liberal sprinkling of reports of speeches by Indians and English, taken from the minutes of conferences in which Sir William or his representatives were involved.

DONALD C. BRYANT,
Washington University

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT: MAN OF DESTINY. By David E. Weingast. New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1952; pp. 184. $2.75.

A biographical study intended to explain for those "too young to remember . . . the Roosevelt era and the important issues with which he was faced," this book does indeed "recapture the spirit of FDR and the period he dominated." Critical students will be disappointed, however, in the author's decisions always to paint the scenes in the most favorable possible manner for Roosevelt. Admiration for FDR and eagerness that today's youth appreciate him

scarcely justify such conclusions as "the New Deal was saved" by FDR's battle with the Supreme Court and for Roosevelt to have declared himself earlier as a third-term candidate "would have served no good purpose."

EARNEST BRANDENBURG,
Washington University

THINKING. By George Humphry. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1951; pp. 331. $4.50.

A scholarly work reviewing and interpreting psychological experimentation and the theories of thought evolving from them. Technically, the book is of value principally to advanced theorists in the nature of thought and learning. It reflects the influence of British and European psychologists more than American scholars.

THOMAS F. STATON,
Air University

BOOKS RECEIVED

ON YOUR LEFT THE MILKY WAY. By Dorothy Kaucher. Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1952; pp. 308. $4.50. (Miss Kaucher, who received a Ph.D. in "English and Speech" from Cornell University, "combines personal anecdotes, travelogue, description and historical lore and legend," as she continues her writing on the "American pioneering theme.")

GAMBLING IN AMERICA. Edited by Herbert L. Marx, Jr. The Reference Shelf, Volume 23, Number 6. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1952; pp. 222. $1.75. ("A compilation of articles laying open the pattern of gambling throughout history and around the world, with emphasis on the United States.")

POLITICAL ETHICS AND THE VOTER. Edited by Thomas A. Rousse. The Reference Shelf, Volume 24, Number 1. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1952; pp. 181. $1.75. (Evidence is marshaled "under two main divisions: The Present Situation, and Causes and Remedies.")

FEDERAL TAXES. Edited by Clifton H. Kreps, Jr. The Reference Shelf, Volume 24, Number 2. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1952; pp. 183. $1.75. (". . . An impartial selection to present in their own words the arguments of the leaders of different schools of political and economic thought.")

GENERAL EDUCATION IN THEORY AND PRACTICE. By John P. Wynne. New York: Bookman Associates, 1952; pp. 251. (Here is one-man analysis of general education without emphasis on any particular type or institution and with regard to practical as well as philosophical aspects. It includes a provocative chapter on ends.)

GENERAL EDUCATION IN ACTION. By B. Lamar Johnson, Director of the Study Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1952; pp. xxvi+409. $4.00. (This report of the California study of general education in the junior college should have general appeal. It includes an excellent section on goals of general education.)

EDUCATION AND THE DEMOCRATIC IDEAL. By A. G. Hughes. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1951; pp. xi+138. $1.85. ("A collection of nine talks to teachers given on various occasions during the past few years by the Chief Inspector of the Education Department of the London County Council. The author describes the democratic ideal as the liberation of the creative spirit in every individual.")

SHAKESPEARE MEMORIAL THEATRE 1948—1950, A PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD. Forewords by Ivor Brown and Anthony Quayle. Photographs by Angus McBean. Theatre Arts Books, 1951; pp. 18+ unnumbered pages. $4.50. ("A photographic record of three important years in the history of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre. . . . Photographs taken during the successful tour of Australia are also included.")

DIRECTED DRAMA, PRACTICAL METHODS IN DRAMATIC ACTIVITY. By David C. Pethybridge. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1951; pp. 120. $2.00. ("The aim . . . is to focus attention on what can be done—on what *has*, in fact, been done—towards the development of children's personalities through dramatic channels.")

EXCURSIONS INTO PRACTICAL COMPOSITION. Collected and edited by Garland Greever. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952; pp. xvi+377. $2.50. ("To help the average college student develop an ability to express facts and ideas on paper. . . . The major part of the space, as well as priority in order, is assigned to Part I: Functional Writing—Communication.")

THE TECHNIQUE OF CLEAR WRITING. By Robert Gunning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952; pp. x+289. $3.50.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE MADE EASY. By Rheva Ott Shryock. Philadelphia: College Offset Press, 1949; pp. unnumbered. $2.00.

IN THE PERIODICALS

Laura Crowell, *Editor*

Inasmuch as the American regional and professional journals in the field doubtless come regularly to the attention of members of the profession, this department will limit its reference to periodicals not officially or directly concerned with speech. Readers are therefore referred to the current issues of American Speech, The Central States Speech Journal, The Southern Speech Journal, The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, Educational Theatre Journal, Speech Monographs, *and* Western Speech.

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

LAURA CROWELL
University of Washington

BRYSON, LYMAN, "Notes on a Theory of Advice," *Political Science Quarterly*, LXVI (September 1951), 321-339.

Bryson analyzes the factors involved in decision-making in government, industry, and organization, and points out the necessity of finding how knowledge may be put at the service of power.

COIT, MARGARET L., "Calhoun and the Downfall of States' Rights," *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, XXVIII (Spring 1952), 191-208.

An explanation denying the historical characterization of Calhoun as the defender of states' rights and showing his movement "from states' rights to regionalism to proportional representation."

DAILEY, CHARLES A., "The Effects of Premature Conclusion upon the Acquisition of Understanding of a Person," *The Journal of Psychology*, XXXIII (January 1952), 133-152.

A series of four experiments showing the observer to be affected "by his own judgments about the person under consideration" and to be less influenced by additional data.

JOHNSON, WENDELL, "Symbolic Processes in Personality Development," *ETC.*, IX (Autumn 1951), 29-34.

Urges that individuals develop and maintain an alertness to the degree of clearness and validity in their own statements and those of others by the repeated use of appropriate questions.

LASKER, BRUNO, "Lincoln and World Human Rights," *The Survey*, LXXXVIII (February 1952), 82-83.

Lincoln's belief that liberty is threatened everywhere when denied anywhere makes him one of the originators of a world code of fundamental human rights.

LIVINGSTONE, RICHARD, "The Essentials of Education," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXXIX (January 1952), 45-48.

Originally a lecture delivered at the American International College in Springfield, Massachusetts, urging attention to great literature and to history to show "what is first-rate in human personality and human character."

MALCOLM, NORMAN, "Knowledge and Belief," *Mind*, LXI (April 1952), 178-189.

An examination of two senses of the word *know* in relation to *a priori* and empirical statements.

MALIN, JAMES C., "The Motives of Stephen A. Douglas in the Organization of Nebraska Territory: A Letter Dated December 17, 1853," *The Kansas Historical Quarterly*, XIX (November 1951), 321-353.

An analysis of previous interpretations of Douglas's motives and the presentation of a letter written just prior to the opening of the famous debates.

MASON, ALPHEUS THOMAS, "The Federalist—A Split Personality," *The American Historical Review*, LVII (April 1952), 625-643.

An examination of the ideas expounded in the Federalist papers, demonstrating the "diversity of genius" in the two principal authors.

PETERSON, MERRILL D., "The Jefferson Image, 1829," *American Quarterly*, III (Fall 1951), 204-220.

A study of the inflammatory effect of the publication of *The Memoirs* three years after his death.

REICHENBACH, HANS, "The Syllogism Revised," *Philosophy of Science*, XIX (January 1952), 1-16.

Suggesting a combination of some of the traditional with certain modern features to provide a complete and accurate theory for use in logic courses.

RHOADES, DONALD H., "Jonathan Edwards: America's First Philosopher," *The Personalist*, XXXIII (Spring 1952), 135-147.

An exposition of Edwards' ideas as to being, causation, value, knowledge, and methodology, pointing out the modern note in his delineation of existential knowledge.

RITCHESON, CHARLES R., "The Elder Pitt and an American Department," *The American Historical Review*, LVII (January 1952), 376-383.

An outline for formation of a ministry probably cast up by Pitt in July of 1766 shows his plan for an American department to be headed by himself.

ROGERS, CARL R., "Communication: Its Blocking and its Facilitation," *ETC.*, IX (Winter 1952), 83-88.

Rogers points to the tendency to judge the statements of another as the "major barrier" to communication, and suggests the facilitation of communication by listening with "real understanding."

TAYLOR, JOHN H., "Political Motives in Cicero's Defense of Archias," *American Journal of Philology*, LXXIII (January 1952), 62-70.

Cicero was not only defending Archias in order to uphold poetry but was taking a political stand aimed at the preservation of the political system he favored.

TOMAS, VINCENT, "The Modernity of Jonathan Edwards," *The New England Quarterly*, XXV (March 1952), 60-84.

An examination of Edwards' stand on crucial issues shows him a medieval rather than a modern philosopher.

WATSON, RICHARD L., JR., "Theodore Roosevelt: *The Years of Preparation, 1868-1900*," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, LI (April 1952), 301-315.

An attempt to set aside the frequent caricaturing portrayals of Theodore Roosevelt and to analyze more aptly some of the factors in his rapid rise to the presidency.

ZELKO, HAROLD P., "Improving Communications Means Speech Training," *Manage*, III (September-1950), 24-26.

Presenting the need for improved communications in industry and business and a method for solving the problem through training.

DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

WESLEY WIKSELL
Louisiana State University

BOYD, HARRY E., "The 'Buzz' Technique in Training," *Personnel Journal*, XXXI (June 1952), 49-50.

Dividing the supervisors into small groups to talk about specific applications of the contract and having reports to the whole group resulted in an interesting and constructive conference.

BROWN, IDA STEWART, "Group Development in a Junior High School Student Council," *Educational Leadership*, IX (May 1952), 496-501.

A report of several months of study of a school council by a team engaged in a research project in group development.

BUEHLER, E. C., "Delivery in Debate," *Speech Activities*, VIII (Spring 1952), 12-13+.

A description of the more glaring deficiencies of debate delivery, and suggestions for improvement.

CANTOR, NATHANIEL, "Focus and Function in Group Discussion," *Teachers College Record*, LIII (April 1952), 375-382.

The leader's function is to put his "difference" at the service of the group: the group should work for compromise (which profits from similarities and differences) as a more realistic goal than consensus.

DE BOER, JOHN J., "Implications of Group Dynamics for English," *The English Journal*, XLI (May 1952), 239-244.

Concepts from the group dynamics movement are summarized in application to problems of group discussion.

DIVESTA, F. J., J. ROACH, and W. BEASLEY, "Rating Conference Participation in a Human Relations Training Program," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, XXXV (December 1951), 386-391.

The devising of a scale is explained and conclusions are summarized.

GLADSTONE, ROY, "A Factor in the Degeneration of Discussions," *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, XLIII (March 1952), 176-178.

One likely cause of degeneration in verbal negotiations is examined; a vivid aid in driving that cause home to the student is presented.

HARE, A. PAUL, "A Study of Interaction and Consensus in Different Sized Groups," *American Sociological Review*, XVII (June 1952), 261-267.

Differences in degree of consensus, demands on skill from leader, and feelings of group satisfaction were found.

LANDECKER, WERNER S., "Integration and Group Structure: An Area for Research," *Social Forces*, XXX (May 1952), 394-400.

A theoretical scheme, dealing with integration variables at a high level, from which a number of research problems may be derived is suggested.

LAUE, GILBERT P., "Dan's Turn," *Adult Leadership*, I (May 1952), 3-10.

A description of the problems which a program chairman encountered, a list of obstacles to planning effective meetings, and suggestions for overcoming them are given.

LEVINE, J., and J. BUTLER, "Lecture vs. Group Decision in Changing Behavior," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, XXXVI (February 1952), 29-33.

Experimentation showed group decision to be more effective than formal lecture in overcoming resistance to change in behavior.

LUCK, THOMAS, "Goodyear Educates the Educators," *Personnel*, XXVIII (May 1952), 501-506.

A detailed description is given of Goodyear's industrial forum in which a group of professors participated.

LUKE, ROBERT A., "The Chairman Gets Help," *Adult Leadership*, I (June 1952), 5-6.

An example tells how a leadership team planned a meeting and how the idea worked out in practice.

PLANTY, EARL, and WILLIAM MACHAVER, "Upward Communications: A Project in Executive Development," *Personnel*, XXVIII (January 1952), 304-318.

These authors describe the syndicate system of operation, a new learning technique imported from England.

ROETHLISBERGER, F. J., "Barriers to Communication Between Men," *ETC.*, IX (Winter 1952), 89-93.

"The biggest block to personal communication is man's inability to listen intelligently, understandingly, and skillfully to another person."

SEMRAD, ELVIN S., and JOHN ARSENIAN, "The Use of Group Processes in Teaching Group Dynamics," *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, CVIII (1951), 358-363.

A description is given of a method used at the Boston State Hospital for teaching group dynamics through experimentation in creating groups.

SOBEL, MORTON J., "Sociodrama in the Classroom," *Social Education*, XVI (April 1952), 166-168.

This article explains values in classroom use and suggests basic steps to be taken by the teacher in initiating the method.

THOMPSON, WAYNE N., "National Contest in Public Discussion," *Speech Activities*, VIII (Summer 1952), 41-42.

A report on the outcome of the First National Contest in Public Discussion is presented with a critical commentary and an announcement of plans for 1952-53.

WIETING, C. MAURICE, "Local Councils Help Steer Co-op Course," *News for Farmer Cooperatives*, XIX (April 1952), 5+.

A brief description of the work of the 1,550 farmer discussion groups conducted by the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation is followed by a listing of factors in the program's success.

WICK, ROBERT, "Burden of Proof," *The Speaker*, XXXIV (March 1952), 16-17.

A restatement is offered of this first principle of debate that "he who affirms must prove" to aid the beginning student.

ZELKO, HAROLD P., "Speech in Lawyer-Client Relations," *The Gavel*, XXXIV (May 1952), 58-62, 76.

The author points out the many varied speaking responsibilities of the lawyer in his total relationship with his clients with special emphasis on office counseling.

RADIO AND TELEVISION

HALE AARNES
University of North Dakota

BRODERICH, GERTRUDE G., "Radio and Recordings as Aids to Teaching," *School Life*, XXXIV (April 1952), 104-105, 108.

A discussion of pre-listening and post-listening techniques which will increase the effectiveness of radio and recordings as classroom aids.

"Educational Television Is Coming—and Soon," *Business Week* (May 17, 1952), 182, 184, 186, 188.

A summary of opportunities and pitfalls confronting educational groups interested in owning and operating "educational" television stations.

FAUGHT, MILLARD C., "The Future of Television," *Harvard Business Review*, XXX (May-June 1952), 41-49.

Opposing the freezing of television to the pattern of operation which controls radio.

Nineteen problems are discussed as to their probable import on the future of a television industry free of radio's domination.

"FCC Television Decision Opens New Era for Education," *School Life*, XXXIV (June 1952), 136-137, 140.

A concise presentation of the scope of the opportunity in television broadcasting given American education by the FCC on April 14, 1952.

HIFT, FRED, "Pay As You View TV," *Theatre Arts*, XXXVI (April 1952), 27-28, 77.

A consideration of two new possibilities in the television field: theatre television and subscription television. Economic implications in these developments are also suggested.

KLOTS, ALLEN T., "Trial by Television," *Harper's Magazine*, CCIII (October 1951), 90-94.

A noted New York lawyer explores the individual's rights as they are affected by televised judicial and quasi-judicial inquiries.

OSBORNE, TRUDIE, "TV Gold Rush," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXXIX (May 1952), 44-47.

A fact-filled statement of legal, economic, and administrative obstacles retarding the development of the potentially profitable television industry.

SCOTT, CLIFFORD J., "TV Suggestions for Teachers," *NEA Journal*, XLI (May 1952), 286.

A list of suggestions designed to help students improve the quality of their television viewing.

SMITH, BERNARD B., "Can Unsponsored TV Pay Its Way?" *Harper's Magazine*, CCIV (February 1952), 97-99.

An attorney suggests that "the one and . . . only feasible method by which an educational television station can support itself is by dedicating up to three hours a day to telecasting current films, sport events, and, in time, plays . . . on a subscription . . . basis."

STEINER, PETER O., "Program Patterns and Preferences, and the Workability of Competition in Radio Broadcasting," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, LXVI (May 1952), 194-223.

An analysis of the discrepancy between a socially optimal pattern of programs and the pattern likely to emerge from the organizational structure of the industry.

"Syracuse Survey Reaffirms Radio's Position," *Broadcasting-Telecasting*, XLII (February 25, 1952), 25, 38.

Reports from two surveys suggest that television viewing supplements radio listening but does not replace more than one-third of such listening.

VAN HORNE, HARRIET, "Radio Grows Up," *Theatre Arts*, XXXVI (May 1952), 36-37, 98-99.

Signs of coming maturity in radio programming.

DRAMA

ALBERT E. JOHNSON
University of Texas

BENTLEY, ERIC, "We Need Pirandello Today," *Theatre Arts*, XXXVI (May 1952), 23-24, 87.

The body of Pirandello's work "places him with Ibsen, Strindberg, Chekhov, and Shaw as one of the five masters of the modern stage." His plays are more meaningful today than they could have been in the twenties.

BOORMAN, JOHN, "Drama in Spain," *Theatre*, VI (June 7, 1952), 13-15.

Although superficially the theatre in Spain is very active, the supply of theatres and plays exceeds the demand. Two evils are dominant: lack of money and the survival of the actor-manager system.

HOLLAND, DONALD, "Script-in-Hand Performances," *Players*, XXVII (May 1951), 175.

Here is an answer to the high school director who must produce several plays and assemblies, to the college director who must simultaneously train his actors and adhere to a full production schedule, and to the harried community theatre director.

KRUTCH, JOSEPH WOOD, "Eugene O'Neill, the Lonely Revolutionary," *Theatre Arts*, XXXVI (April 1952), 29-30, 78.

O'Neill "attempted Tragedy—with a capital T" and achieved for American dramatists the right to be as serious and to aim as high as they wish.

LADER, LAWRENCE, "The Palace Theatre: Broadway's Shrine," *Coronet*, XXXII (July 1952), 51-54.

A brief history of this theatre ("Vaudeville's Mecca") and its recent comeback, one of the most sensational in Broadway history.

MANVELL, ROGER, "Shakespeare As a Scriptwriter," *World Review*, XXXIX (May 1952), 56-59.

Discussion of similarities between the Elizabethan theatre and our contemporary cinema, and of the special suitability of Shakespeare's plays for presentation on film or television.

MYERS, PAUL, "Specialists," *Dramatics*, XXIII (May 1952), 11, 30.

An examination of the lives and work of some of the theatre's specialists, one-man show artists such as Cornelia Otis Skinner, John Carradine, and Angna Enters.

PRIESTLEY, J. B., "Platform Piece," *Theatre*, VI (June 21, 1952), 10-13.

Priestley writes about several English productions of *Dragon's Mouth*, his four-character discussion play inspired by Charles Laughton's method of staging *Don Juan in Hell*.

SMITH, CECIL, "American Musical Comedy," *World Theatre*, II, No. 1, 40-47.

Since *Oklahoma!* in 1943, "American musical comedy has moved forward chiefly . . . in the direction of smoothness and felicity of presentation."

TROUBRIDGE, ST. VINCENT, "Some Pseudonyms of Dramatic Authors, 1800-1900," *Theatre Notebook*, (April-June 1952), 63-64.

A short but interesting list of pseudonyms that escaped Allardyce Nicoll's attention in his histories of the nineteenth century drama.

WILLIAMS, TENNESSEE, "In the Script: *A Streetcar Named Desire*," *Sight and Sound*, XXI (April-June 1952), 173-175.

A comparison of the ending moments of the play with Williams' alternate endings for the motion picture.

INTERPRETATIVE READING

WILLIAM B. MCCOARD
University of Southern California

BOGARDUS, EMORY S., "Social Distance in Poetry," *Sociology and Social Research*, XXXVI (September-October 1951), 40-47.

Examples of searching insight by poets into the causes of social distance between individuals, and between individuals and groups.

CRAIG, FLORENCE S., "Book Reviews, Opiates or Eye-Openers," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, XXVI (April 1952), 646-650.

An attempt to show how book reviews can be improved by discussion and reading aloud; also suggestion of some techniques for oral reading.

EMMANUEL, PIERRE, "The Critic and the Commonplace," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXXIX (May 1952), 67-70.

An interpretation of a critic's function in understanding poetry, poets, and the reader.

FLATTER, RICHARD, "The Veil of Beauty: Some Aspects of Verse and Prose in Shakespeare and Goethe," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, L (October 1951), 437-450.

A discussion of Shakespeare's use of verse and prose to express nature, as opposed to Goethe's use of poetry to hide nature, and an interesting treatment of natural emotional speech as verse.

HEWES, HENRY, "Olivier and His Green Umbrellas," *The Saturday Review of Literature*, XXXV (March 8, 1952), 29-31.

An account of Laurence Olivier's techniques and tricks for interpreting and projecting a character. Comments on techniques for reading poetry generally and different authors specifically.

KNOX, GEORGE A., "Quest for the Word in Eliot's *Four Quartets*," *Journal of English Literary History*, XVIII (December 1951), 310-321.

Explication and interpretation of Eliot's poetry and purposes.

LAUGHTON, CHARLES, "Storytelling," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXXV (June 1950), 71-72.

Report of his lengthy preparation to read "as if I were the author inventing the story. . . . The smallest part [was] the learning of these stories by heart."

PERKINS, DAVID, "Arnold and The Function of Literature," *Journal of English Literary History*, XVIII (December 1951), 287-309.

A scholarly consideration of Arnold's principles in three sections: Culture as Process and Ideal; Literature and the Interpretation of Human Experience; Literature and the Formative Development of Human Nature.

POPKIN, HENRY, "Poets as Performers: The Revival of Poetry-Reading," *Theatre Arts*, XXXVI (February 1952), 27+.

The current revival of poetry-reading has turned poets themselves into dramatic performers. Popkin reports skillfully on methods, manners, and techniques of Frost, Sitwell, Eliot, and Dylan Thomas.

RANSOM, JOHN CROWE, "An Age of Criticism," *New Republic*, CXXVI (March 31, 1952), 18-19.

Critics find and prepare audiences, who for the most part will read with the eye for the ear of the imagination, if not for the actual ear.

REMENYI, JOSEPH, "Literature on Television," *School and Society*, LXXV (February 2, 1952), 70-72.

A suggestive report of the author's experience teaching via television; a helpful message to those who face a new day in education that the teacher need not be a dramatic actor.

TATE, ALLEN, "To Whom is the Poet Responsible?" *The Hudson Review*, IV (Autumn 1951), 325-334.

Some have tried to make the poet responsible for the moral, political, and social well-being of society; he is, however, a source of knowledge—more reporter than proponent.

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS

BERT EMSLEY
Ohio State University

ARNOLD, G. F., "Context in English Intonation Teaching," *Le maître phonétique*, No. 97, 3d series (January-June 1952), 9-11.

"Specimen sentences must remain but should be given with the context, appropriate for one or more of the variations of the pattern involved."

BERGMAN, GUSTAV, "Two Types of Linguistic Philosophy," *The Review of Metaphysics*, V (March 1952), 417-438.

". . . the formalists devote themselves to the construction of symbolic systems, so-called artificial languages, while the antiformalists are students of philosophically correct usage, probers and pruners of the language we speak."

BOLINGER, DWIGHT L., "Intonation: Levels versus Configurations," *Word*, VII (December 1951), 199-210.

Listeners responded to similarities and differences in configurational patterns.

FARR, JAMES N., *et al.*, "Reply to Klare and Flesch re 'Simplification of the Flesch Reading Ease Formula,'" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, XXXVI (February 1952), 55-57.

The new formula requiring counting of one-syllable words only has proved to be "time-saving."

HEATH, P. L., "The Appeal to Ordinary Language," *The Philosophical Quarterly*, II (January 1952), 1-12.

Argument against the thesis that philosophical problems are generally due to departures from Standard English or ordinary language.

HOCKETT, CHARLES F., "A Formal Statement of Morphemic Analysis," *Studies in Linguistics*, X (June 1952), 27-39.

". . . there is, as yet, far less rigor and far more rule-of-thumb in linguistic analysis than we should like to believe."

LLOYD, DONALD J., "Our National Mania for Correctness," *The American Scholar*, XXI (Summer 1952), 283-289.

". . . the ordinary American is in conversation a confident, competent expressive being. In writing he is something else again."

MILLHOUSER, MILTON, "The Case against Slang," *The English Journal*, XLI (June 1952), 306-339.

"Much of it has its origin in thieves' cant and faded scatalogy, much more in an indolent and sullen grudging of distinctions. . . . Slang is not merely informal; it is a little flashy."

SMITH, JAMES E., "Use of Readability Techniques in Constructing a Problem Check List," *Educational Research Bulletin*, XXXI (May 14, 1952), 129-133, 140.

Trial runs on a parental problem check list seemed to indicate the value of trying to use the language of the audience while checking against standard word lists for readability.

SNYDER, ALAN, "The Open-Book Vocabulary Test," *College English*, XIII (May 1952), 458-460.

The student is tested in associating words which have been thoroughly studied with dictated statements which require him to think about similarities in ideas rather than synonyms.

SPITZER, LEO, "Slang," *Modern Language Notes*, LXVII (February 1952), 99-103.

In agreement with Eric Partridge that "slang is language *slung* about," Spitzer finds its social origin in the cant of itinerant peddlers or showmen, rather than thieves.

STORER, THOMAS, "Linguistic Isomorphisms," *Philosophy of Science*, XIX (January 1952), 77-85.

"To philosophize is to construct, in accordance with certain minimal requirements, an exact formal language capable of describing experience."

TATTERSFIELD, ANN C., "The Speech and Language of the Pre-School Child," *Speech*, XVI (April 1952), 8-20.

In Newcastle-upon-Tyne 880 children have been observed for more than three years; complete data and analysis are given on phonetic sounds, intelligibility, vocabulary size, sentences, and some correlation with social class.

VOEGELIN, C. F., "Edward Sapir," *Word Study*, XXVII (April 1952), 1-3.

Sapir's life included productive periods on the West Coast, in Canada, at Chicago, and at Yale, combining interest in language, an-

thropology, poetry, music, culture, and personality.

WILDER, THORNTON, "Toward an American Language," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CXC (July 1952), 29-37.

Some passages in *Moby Dick*, typical of American tendencies, are primarily oratorical, crying aloud "to be declaimed *standing up*."

SPEECH SCIENCE

LORETTA WAGNER SMITH
Brooklyn College

BEKESY, GEORG V., "D C Resting Potentials Inside the Cochlear Partition," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XXIV (January 1952), 72-76.

Presenting a preliminary attempt to measure the resting potentials and posing the further problem of locating a membrane with variable insulation.

GARNER, W. R., "An Equal Discriminability Scale for Loudness Judgments," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XLIII (March 1952), 232-238.

Four experiments involving judgments of the loudness of tones presented one at a time were made, scales of equal discriminability constructed, and conclusions drawn.

GILBERT, G. M., "Stereotype Persistence and Change among College Students," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLVI (April 1951), 245-254.

"The present generation of college students is more reluctant than the previous generation to make stereotyped generalizations about the character of ethnic groups, especially those with whom they have had little contact."

GREGG, L. W., and W. J. GROGDEN, "The Effect of Simultaneous Visual Stimulation of Absolute Auditory Sensitivity," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XLIII (March 1952), 179-186.

Auditory thresholds rose significantly as brightness increased when a specific verbal response to the auxiliary stimulus was required, and lowered significantly when no response to the auxiliary stimulus was asked.

HARRIS, HERBERT H., and K. L. WATTLEWORTH, "Tumors of the Larynx, Review of One Hundred and Sixteen Cases," *Archives of Otolaryngology*, LIII (June 1951), 640-645.

A need exists for convincing the public of the importance of evaluation of hoarseness. Many of the thirty-five of the sixty patients who had hoarseness six months or longer could have been spared the tragic end and much of the disabling treatment had their cases been correctly diagnosed earlier.

JEWELL, BRUCE T., and HELMUT WURSTEN, "Observations on the Psychological Testing of Cerebral Palsied Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LVI (January 1952), 630-637.

Description of a testing program involving 325 cerebral palsied children in which attempts were made to assess mental development in terms of relatively "strong" and "weak" points.

KENWORTHY, R. W., and T. D. BURNAM, "The Absorption Coefficients of Fir Plywood Panels," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XXIII (September 1951), 531-532.

The absorption coefficients of flat, splayed, and cylindrical panel assemblies constructed from three-ply fir plywood indicate that they are important acoustical materials in the lower frequency range.

MCCONNELL, FREEMAN, "The Child with High Frequency Hearing Loss," *The Volta Review*, LIII (July 1951), 295-297, 328.

Why marked high frequency loss may lead to mismanagement both at home and at school unless diagnosed early. Audiograms of three children show that difficulties due to high frequency loss seem closely related to the audiometric contour in the speech range.

MIODONSKI, JAN, "An Inner-Middle Ear Test," *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, XXXIX (August 1951), 296-299.

A simple test for differentiating conduction and perception deafness usable in an out-patient department, also of value in the "appreciation of operative prognoses in otosclerotic patients."

OSGOOD, CHARLES E., "The Nature and Measurement of Meaning," *Psychological Bulletin*, XLIX (May 1952), 197-237.

An evaluation of physiological, learning, perception, association, and scaling methods of approach to the problem of measuring meaning, and the proposal of a semantic differential as a general approach.

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

WILLIAM W. FLETCHER
University of Minnesota

BAKWIN, RUTH, and HARRY BAKWIN, "Clutter-ing," *Journal of Pediatrics*, XL (March 1952), 393-396.

A description of the clinical characteristics of cluttering, the essential differences between it and stuttering, and a therapeutic approach.

BERGMAN, PHILIP S., and MARTIN GREEN, "Aphasia: Effect of Intravenous Sodium Amytal," *Neurology*, I (November-December 1951), 471-475.

The report of a study involving 47 aphasics. No improvement in speech facility followed the administration of sodium amytal.

BOBATH, KAREL, and BERTA BOBATH, "A Treatment of Cerebral Palsy," *British Journal of Physical Medicine*, XV (May 1952), 107-116.

A program for teaching movements to the cerebral palsied by taking them gradually through stages of the normal developmental sequence and by teaching the inhibition of interfering reflex mechanisms.

BROWN, SPENCER F., "Diagnosis and Treatment of Dyslalia," *Journal Lancet*, LXXII (May 1952), 229-230.

This brief review of the diagnostic and prognostic signs in non-organic articulatory disorders of children is directed principally to pediatricians. Included are a few words on therapy and referral.

CRUICKSHANK, WILLIAM, and JANE E. DOLPHIN, "The Educational Implications of Psychological Studies of Cerebral-Palsied Children," *Exceptional Children*, XVIII (October 1951) 1-8.

A review of the reported research in psychology of the brain-injured child is followed by suggested procedures and devices for producing an optimal learning environment for such children.

DI CARLO, LOUIS M., and JANE E. DOLPHIN, "Social Adjustment and Personality Development of Deaf Children: A Review of Literature," *Exceptional Children*, XVIII (January 1952), 111-118.

The review of published research findings precedes an indictment of the research methodology used. Noted were a lack of adequate control of incidental variables and a failure to utilize standardized measurement criteria.

FROESCHELS, EMIL, "Some Important Links Between Logopedics and Otolaryngology," *Folia Phoniatrica*, IV (1952), 1-8.

The "chewing method" of voice and speech therapy is explained and a "pushing method" of re-establishing voice without surgical intervention in cases of laryngeal adductor paralysis is described.

HOLDEN, RAYMOND H., "Improved Methods in Testing Cerebral Palsied Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LVI (October 1951), 349-353.

A reminder that the range of intellectual ability, rather than a numerical I.Q., is of paramount interest to speech therapists. Currently available tests can be used profitably with the cerebral palsied if slightly modified.

INGVARSSON, IVAR M., "Language Teaching in Schools for the Deaf: Psychological Aspects," *American Annals of the Deaf*, XCVII (March 1952), 267-281.

The absence of speech "represses" all thought in linguistic form. Perceptual and intellectual deficits are essential concomitants of deafness. Suggestions are given for instruction in oral communication skills.

JONES, JAMES, and ROBERT DINOLT, "Pure Word Deafness," *Laryngoscope*, LXII (February 1952), 194-203.

The speech reception defect known as subcortical sensory aphasia is described, the literature is reviewed, and a case study is presented.

LORE, JAMES I., JR., "The Student with a Hearing Problem," *Delaware School Journal*, XVII (March 1952), 9+.

This article explains typical symptoms, referral procedures, and special services to assist the classroom teacher in assuming her responsibility in hearing rehabilitation.

PALMER, MARTIN F., "Speech Therapy in Cerebral Palsy," *Journal of Pediatrics*, XL (April 1952), 514-524.

Data derived from examinations of 100 consecutive cases of cerebral palsy are presented. Included is information on language performance and on anomalies of speech structures and their functioning.

"Symposium on Cerebral Palsy," *Journal of Pediatrics*, XL (May 1952), 606-632.

Five short papers dealing with early detection of brain injury, recent information based on post-mortem findings in infants, developmental malformations of the brain, and unmet needs in cerebral palsy.

TORN, DANIEL, "Speech and Cleft Palate Partial Denture Prosthesis," *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, II (May 1952), 413-417.

The importance of an adequate speech function is stressed in this explanation of essential prosthodontic rehabilitation in cleft palate cases.

EQUIPMENT

WILLIAM J. TEMPLE, *Editor*

DICKENS'S CHRISTMAS CAROL. *Adapted by Edith Meiser, with Basil Rathbone as Scrooge. Columbia ML 4082, 12" LP.*

Edith Meiser has been a most successful adapter of well-known stories for radio. Her dramatizations of the Sherlock Holmes stories (also with Basil Rathbone as the star performer) were so successful that the series was kept on the air until, like the old "March of Time" program, it began to sound like a parody of itself. But somehow the task of condensing "A Christmas Carol" into a twenty-minute drama has been too much for even her talent.

The recording and the performances are good, as you would expect from the manufacturer and the cast of Hollywood stalwarts, although it is a little startling to recognize the voice of Fibber McGee's "Doc Gamble" (Arthur Q. Bryan) in two of the minor roles. There are other well-known names in the cast, too, including Francis X. Bushman, Raymond Lawrence, Elliott Lewis, Jay Novello, Stuart Robertson, Paula Winslowe and, as narrator, another citizen of Wistful Vista, Harlow Wilcox.

The other side of this record contains a program of eight Christmas carols sung by the Lyn Murray Singers with dignity but also with enough show-business sophistication to spoil the total effect for me.

GERTRUDE STEIN READ BY GERTRUDE STEIN. *Dimension Records, 460 West 57th Street, New York 19, N. Y. 12" LP, 2 sides.*

The recordings which Gertrude Stein made for Columbia University during her visit to the United States in 1934 and 1935 are here transcribed on a single LP disk which includes all of the six sides of the original limited edition.

Miss Stein reads with charming matter-of-factness some of the most controversial literary compositions of our time. Her voice makes sense even when her words seem not to. The selections are entitled "The Making of Americans," "A Valentine to Sherwood Anderson," "If I Told Him: A Completed Portrait of Picasso," "Matisse," and "Madame Recamier (An Opera)." These represent several volumes of Miss Stein's influential and memorable style of writing.

Whether your attitude toward Gertrude Stein is reverence for an Olympian tolerance for an eccentric, or indignation for a fraud, you will find this record interesting. Either as a monument or as a curiosity it is well worth owning.

The transfer from the original discs has been accomplished with admirable skill. This record undoubtedly sounds better than any of the original shellacs that you might be able to find.

CANDID MICROPHONE. VOLUME 2 and VOLUME 3. *Columbia ML 4093 and ML 4450, 12" LP, 6 sides.*

These two disks contain 21 further examples of Allen Funt's now familiar practical joke with the hidden microphone to record the antics of each of us. As I suggested in review of Volume 1 of this series, these records might be used as exercises for transcription by students of phonetics because they represent the all-too-human speech of the layman. But the student must first overcome his distaste for the excessive cruelty of the contrived situations.

In Volume 3 there is a good example of double-take and a useful though not new example of tape splicing, in which the protests of the infuriated host of the joke is replaced by a genial chatter by someone using "Mister."

[illegible] is a most [illegible] record [illegible] Columbia [illegible] 12" LP, 4 sides, sound as [illegible] complete set.

This is a [illegible] produced version of a work which, in its own way, is hardly suitable for phonic. The speaking and singing roles are filled by accomplished actors and singers, but [illegible] Miss Page and Mr. Conrad, there are [illegible] Gertrude Stein, Florence Reed, Alice Brady, Richard Bird, Leon Ames, Lenore Ulric, Tallulah Bankhead, Ethel Barrymore, Judith Anderson and Rosalind Russell. But the characters are little more than those provided by the author herself and the reading [illegible] and the [illegible] are sometimes [illegible] and sometimes merely mordent.

Miss Page sings beautifully, of course, and so do several other members of the cast. The song that most of us remember from this play is "I'll Believe My Heart Hears the Loveliest Things," although we do not recall several pretty songs and memorable lines [illegible] characters in

A description of the clinical characteristics of cluttering, the essential differences between it and stuttering, and a therapeutic approach.

BERGMAN, PHILIP S., and MARTIN GREEN, "Aphasia: Effect of Intravenous Sodium Amytal," *Neurology*, I (November-December 1951), 471-475.

The report of a study involving 47 aphasics. No improvement in speech facility followed the administration of sodium amytal.

BOBATH, KAREL, and BERTA BOBATH, "A Treatment of Cerebral Palsy," *British Journal of Physical Medicine*, XV (May 1952), 107-116.

A program for teaching movements to the cerebral palsied by taking them gradually through stages of the normal developmental sequence and by teaching the inhibition of interfering reflex mechanisms.

BROWN, SPENCER F., "Diagnosis and Treatment of Dyslalia," *Journal Lancet*, LXXII (May 1952), 229-230.

This brief review of the diagnostic and prognostic signs in non-organic articulatory disorders of children is directed principally to pediatricians. Included are a few words on therapy and referral.

CRUICKSHANK, WILLIAM, and JANE E. DOLPHIN, "The Educational Implications of Psychological Studies of Cerebral-Palsied Children," *Exceptional Children*, XVIII (October 1951) 1-8.

A review of the reported research in psychology of the brain-injured child is followed by suggested procedures and devices for producing an optimal learning environment for such children.

DI CARLO, LOUIS M., and JANE E. DOLPHIN, "Social Adjustment and Personality Development of Deaf Children: A Review of Literature," *Exceptional Children*, XVIII (January 1952), 111-118.

The review of published research findings precedes an indictment of the research methodology used. Noted were a lack of adequate control of incidental variables and a failure to utilize standardized measurement criteria.

FROESCHELS, EMIL, "Some Important Links Between Logopedics and Otolaryngology," *Folia Phoniatrica*, IV (1952), 1-8.

The "chewing method" of voice and speech therapy is explained and a "pushing method" of re-establishing voice without surgical intervention in cases of laryngeal adductor paralysis is described.

HOLDEN, RAYMOND H., "Improved Methods in Testing Cerebral Palsied Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LVI (October 1951), 349-353.

A reminder that the range of intellectual ability, rather than a numerical I.Q., is of paramount interest to speech therapists. Currently available tests can be used profitably with the cerebral palsied if slightly modified.

INGVARSSON, IVAR M., "Language Teaching in Schools for the Deaf: Psychological Aspects," *American Annals of the Deaf*, XCVII (March 1952), 267-281.

The absence of speech "represses" all thought in linguistic form. Perceptual and intellectual deficits are essential concomitants of deafness. Suggestions are given for instruction in oral communication skills.

JONES, JAMES, and ROBERT DINOLT, "Pure Word Deafness," *Laryngoscope*, LXII (February 1952), 194-203.

The speech reception defect known as subcortical sensory aphasia is described, the literature is reviewed, and a case study is presented.

LORE, JAMES I., JR., "The Student with a Hearing Problem," *Delaware School Journal*, XVII (March 1952), 9+.

This article explains typical symptoms, referral procedures, and special services to assist the classroom teacher in assuming her responsibility in hearing rehabilitation.

PALMER, MARTIN F., "Speech Therapy in Cerebral Palsy," *Journal of Pediatrics*, XL (April 1952), 514-524.

Data derived from examinations of 100 consecutive cases of cerebral palsy are presented. Included is information on language performance and on anomalies of speech structures and their functioning.

"Symposium on Cerebral Palsy," *Journal of Pediatrics*, XL (May 1952), 606-632.

Five short papers dealing with early detection of brain injury, recent information based on post-mortem findings in infants, developmental malformations of the brain, and unmet needs in cerebral palsy.

TORN, DANIEL, "Speech and Cleft Palate Partial Denture Prosthesis," *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, II (May 1952), 413-417.

The importance of an adequate speech function is stressed in this explanation of essential prosthodontic rehabilitation in cleft palate cases.

EQUIPMENT

WILLIAM J. TEMPLE, *Editor*

DICKENS'S CHRISTMAS CAROL. *Adapted by Edith Meiser, with Basil Rathbone as Scrooge. Columbia ML 4081. 12" LP.*

Edith Meiser has been a most successful adapter of well-known stories for radio. Her dramatizations of the Sherlock Holmes stories (also with Basil Rathbone as the star performer) were so successful that the series was kept on the air until, like the old "March of Time" program, it began to sound like a parody of itself. But somehow the task of condensing "A Christmas Carol" into a twenty-minute drama has been too much for even her talent.

The recording and the performances are good, as you would expect from the manufacturer and the cast of Hollywood stalwarts, although it is a little startling to recognize the voice of Fibber McGee's "Doc Gamble" (Arthur Q. Bryan) in two of the minor roles. There are other well-known names in the cast, too, including Francis X. Bushman, Raymond Lawrence, Elliott Lewis, Jay Novello, Stuart Robertson, Paula Winslowe, and, as narrator, another citizen of Wistful Vista, Harlow Wilcox.

The other side of this record contains a program of eight Christmas carols sung by the Lyn Murray Singers with dignity but also with enough show-business sophistication to spoil the total effect for me.

GERTRUDE STEIN READ BY GERTRUDE STEIN. DR-331. *Dorian Records, 465 West 57th Street, New York 19, N. Y. 12" LP; 2 sides.*

The recordings which Gertrude Stein made for Columbia University during her visit to the United States in 1934 and 1935 are here transcribed on a single LP disk which includes all of the six sides of the original limited edition.

Miss Stein reads with disarming matter-of-factness some of the most controversial literary compositions of our time. Her voice makes sense even when her words seem not to. The selections are entitled "The Making of Americans," "A Valentine to Sherwood Anderson," "If I Told Him (A Completed Portrait of Picasso)," "Matisse," and "Madame Recamier (An Opera)." They represent several varieties of Miss Stein's influential and inimitable style of writing.

Whether your attitude toward Gertrude Stein is reverence for an Olympian, tolerance for an eccentric, or indignation for a fraud, you will find this record interesting. Either as a monument or as a curiosity it is well worth owning.

The transfer from the original disks has been accomplished with admirable skill. This record undoubtedly sounds better than any of the original shellacs that you might be able to find.

CANDID MICROPHONE: VOLUME 2 and VOLUME 3. *Columbia ML 4449 and ML 4450. 12" LP, 4 sides.*

These two disks contain 21 further examples of Allen Funt's now familiar practical joke with the hidden microphone to titillate the sadist in each of us. As I suggested in reviewing Volume I of this series, these episodes might be used as exercises for transcription by students of phonetics because they represent the off-guard speech of the victims. But the student must first overcome his distaste for the intrinsic cruelty of the contrived situations.

In Volume 3 there is a good example of double-talk, and a skilful though too "cute" example of tape splicing in which the profanity of the infuriated butt of the joke is replaced by a gently chiding feminine voice saying "Mister!"

LILY PONS AND NOEL COWARD IN CONVERSATION PIECE, *a musical play in three acts by Noel Coward. Columbia SL-163. Two 12" LP; 4 sides; bound in album with complete text.*

This is a beautifully produced version of a work which, to my taste, was hardly worth the trouble. The speaking and singing roles are filled by accomplished actors and singers. (Besides Miss Pons and Mr. Coward, they are Cathleen Nesbitt, Ethel Griffies, Norah Howard, Ellen Faull, Richard Burton, Rex Evans, Eileen Turner, Dorothy Johnson, and Rosalind Nadell.) But the characters are thin (aside from those provided by the author for himself and his leading lady) and the action slight. The lines are sometimes witty and sometimes merely impudent.

Miss Pons sings beautifully, of course, and so do several other members of the cast. The song that most of us remember from this play is "I'll Follow My Secret Heart." Mr. Coward sings (although he has no voice) several patter songs, and frequently steps out of character to

explain in verses written for this recorded production the settings and the plot. The printed text which is bound into the album (an excellent idea) makes the whole easy to follow.

It is interesting to observe Mr. Coward's technique in assuming a convincing French accent for his role as the Duc de Chaucigny-Varennes. The change is not so much in the speech sounds (although he does change some of them) as in the intonation pattern of the phrases and sentences.

You should not allow my prejudice against Mr. Coward to spoil your pleasure in the enjoyable aspects of this set of records. I don't.

EDGAR ALLAN POE *and* WALT WHITMAN
read by Austin Warren. Idiom Recording Co., 809 Amherst Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 10" LP; 2 sides; printed text.

This record provides an excellent opportunity to observe Mr. Warren's great flexibility of voice and manner as he responds to the variety of emotional expression found in these poems of Poe and Whitman. The Poe works (*The City in the Sea, For Annie,* and *Annabel Lee*), he says in the printed introduction, "exhibit that curious narcotic and necrophiliac mood and tone of incantation, characteristic of much of Poe's greatest poetry." "Tone of incantation" is most appropriately descriptive of the tone of voice Mr. Warren uses in reading these poems. The Whitman work (an abridgement of the *Song of Myself*) begins much more conversationally, but the reader does not slight the "barbaric yawp" in the climaxes.

I found this the least enjoyable of the Warren records, partly because of the selections, but perhaps also because of mechanical matters. Background hiss and other noises are noticeable in the lugubrious Poe bands. The spoken introduction to Whitman is awkwardly placed at the end of the Poe side (this is a ten-inch disk). There are misprints in the printed text and many discrepancies between it and the spoken words.

JOHN MILTON *and* ALEXANDER POPE
read by Austin Warren. Idiom Recording Co., 809 Amherst Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 12" LP; 2 sides; printed text.

Professor Warren opens the Milton side of this record with some unnecessarily condescending remarks about Americans, who, he says, being told that *Lycidas* is one of Milton's "minor" poems, regard it as inferior. He makes up (perhaps) for the slur later when, in introducing the sonnets *To Mr. Lawrence* and *To Cyriack Skinner,* he couples them with *Lycidas* as tests of poetic discernment and modestly admits that he himself was slow to recognize their quality.

In these readings, as in all of his records, Mr. Warren makes skilful use of the pause—a mark of the good reader which it is difficult to persuade students to use.

This record is to me one of the finest in the series. Besides the poems already named, it includes the sonnet *On the Detraction Which Followed upon My Writing Certain Treatises,* and *On the Late Massacre in Piedmont,* which has been called the greatest sonnet ever written.

In *Lycidas,* Mr. Warren seems to read "panoply" for "Panope" and, curiously, in the last line he uses the common misquotation "fresh fields" instead of "fresh woods." "Woods" is given in every text I have consulted, including the text that accompanies the record.

Mr. Warren is very much at home with Alexander Pope. He reads his own abridgement of the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* with spirit and relish.

In this record, as in the Donne records, some questions of pronunciation arise. Mr. Warren is careful to rhyme "oblige" with "besiege" and to pronounce "preserve" as "presarve" even when they do not occur as rhyming words, but he gives no clue to the 18th century usage in the rhymes of *remove-love, break-crack, forms-worms, toad-abroad,* or *given-Heaven.* Perhaps I should not include the last pair of words; the couplet in which they occur is one of several printed in the text but omitted from the spoken record.

EMILY DICKINSON *and* GEORGE HERBERT
read by Austin Warren. Idiom Recording Co., 809 Amherst Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 12" LP; 2 sides; printed text.

Although George Herbert died almost two hundred years before Emily Dickinson was born, this coupling is not at all awkward, and this disk is one of my favorites in the series by Professor Warren. It includes the following nine poems from Herbert's *The Temple: The Collar, Sinne, Prayer, Vertue, The Pulley, The Elixir, The Flower, Even-Song* and *Love,* and on the other side fourteen poems by Emily Dickinson.

I must mention the printed text again. In the Herbert and Dickinson pages there are only a few misprints, but one whole line of a Herbert poem is omitted, and the Dickinson poems are not given in the order in which they are read: the text is therefore confusing.

Conventions and Conferences

T. EARLE JOHNSON, *Editor*

CONVENTION CALENDAR

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA:

1952. Cincinnati, December 29-31, at the Netherland-Plaza Hotel. Program Chairman: H. P. Constans, University of Florida.

1953. New York City, during the week of December 26, at Hotel Statler.

1954. Chicago, during the week of December 26, at the Stevens Hotel.

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THEATRE ASSOCIATION:

1952. Cincinnati, December 29-31, at the Netherland-Plaza Hotel. Program Chairman: Barnard Hewitt, University of Illinois.

AMERICAN SPEECH AND HEARING ASSOCIATION:

1952. Detroit, November 20-22. Program Chairman: Stanley Ainsworth, Florida State University.

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH ASSOCIATION:

1953. Late Spring. Convention plans to be announced.

NEW ENGLAND SPEECH ASSOCIATION:

1952. Boston, Massachusetts, November 21-22. Program Chairman: Edmund Cortez.

PACIFIC SPEECH ASSOCIATION:

1953. Late Spring. Convention plans to be announced.

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION:

1953. Greenville, South Carolina, March 30-April 4, at the Poinsett Hotel. Program Chairman: Batsell B. Baxter, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee.

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF THE EASTERN STATES:

1953. Late Spring. Convention plans to be announced.

WESTERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION:

1952. Denver, Colorado, November 27-29. Program Chairman: William B. McCoard, University of Southern California.

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vice President H. P. Constans of the Speech Association of America is actively working on the program for the national convention which will be held at the Netherland-Plaza and the Sinton Hotels in Cincinnati on December 29, 30, 31, 1952. As is customary, the AETA, the National University Extension Association, and the National Society for the Study of Communication are working cooperatively with Mr. Constans in building an outstanding program. Possibly to a greater extent than ever before, committees and special groups within SAA have been called upon to assist in the program planning. The overall emphasis is designed to interest all members of the speech profession. While not giving undue prominence to any area of interest, the membership will have unusual opportunity to participate in the discussion and ask questions of those on the program.

In addition to the regular program, certain special features have been planned and those in attendance will find that the city of Cincinnati will prove to be a generous and gracious host.

SECOND NATIONAL CONTEST IN PUBLIC DISCUSSION

The first Annual Contest in Public Discussion was an attempt to preserve the values of competition in this forensic form and at the same time to eliminate many of the difficulties that have made previous contests unsatisfactory. The principal differences between the new contest and those previously in existence were: (1) competition was between groups rather than individuals, (2) the programs were judged on the basis of tape recordings, and (3) the format was public discussion rather than group discussion. Each of these items deserves brief comment.

Much of the difficulty of existing contests seemed to be due to the fact that discussion is theoretically a cooperative search for the solution to a problem, yet the contestants were engaged in competing against one another for honors. The present thesis is that competition is not necessarily bad, but that it has been seriously misused. The National Contest in Public Discussion gives no individual ratings, but the judges do make critical comments concerning the various participants.

The principal advantage of tape recording is expense. The Forensic Director can make the program on his own campus, send it to national headquarters, and receive in return the critical

comments of three or more speech instructors.

Public discussion is the type of presentation familiar to most citizens through such radio programs as "The University of Chicago Round Table," "Northwestern Reviewing Stand," and "Invitation to Learning." Unlike group discussion which aims at the solution of a problem, public discussion aims at a group presentation of instructional material.

The First National Contest in Public Discussion was completed last December with seventeen colleges and universities from twelve states participating. The second Annual Contest will be carried out this fall. Full details may be secured by writing to Dr. Wayne N. Thompson, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago 11, Illinois. The Intention of Entry is to be mailed by November 1, and recordings are to be completed by November 15. The tournament entry fee is $2.00. The contest is open to all colleges and universities in the United States. The topic is the national discussion question, and the length of the recording is twenty-five minutes.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

The principal officers of the Association, President Lionel Crocker and First Vice President Phil Constans, attended the 1952 meeting of the American Council on Education which was held last January in Washington, D. C.

These officers of the Speech Association of America had the opportunity of rubbing shoulders with representatives of other constituent members of the American Council on Education. Of even greater value was the opportunity to make specific plans for the Cincinnati Convention early in the year.

The theme was Education and National Security, and the speakers were nationally known figures. Erwin D. Canham, of *The Christian Science Monitor*, gave a newspaperman's comment on the basic analysis of the world we face. Henry H. Hill, President of Peabody College for Teachers, spoke on "The Role of the Schools." His theme was that in spite of the fact that the national emergency is to be with us for a long time we must not neglect our public schools, for 90 percent of all the 14,000,000 members of the armed forces in World War II came from the public schools. Education of all kinds should have high priority in a period of national defense. To complement Dr. Hill's address, Henry T. Heald, Chancellor of New York University, spoke on the issues facing higher education: "Whatever course our national history may take in the next few years and in the long-range future, it is axiomatic that people will determine the events that shape our destiny. The wisdom or folly of their thoughts and actions will derive partly from their native intelligence, but even more from their acquired information and the sense of values which higher education has implanted in their minds."

The speaker for the luncheon on Saturday was Dr. Raymond Bernard Allen, who is connected with the psychological services of the government. He has been elected recently to the presidency of the University of California, Los Angeles. The luncheon was well attended, and your officers sat at the same table with Chancellor Henry T. Heald. Dr. Allen gave first hand accounts of attempts to meet foreign propaganda with materials that set forth democratic America in the best light.

DISCUSSION ROUND TABLES

For the convention at Cincinnati the SAA Committee on Discussion and Group Methods will sponsor during the morning and afternoon of Sunday, December 28, two simultaneous round tables dealing with the following questions:

1. On what type of research in discussion should men in the field of speech concentrate their efforts?

2. How can skill in conference and discussion most effectively be taught?

As Chairman of the SAA Committee on Discussion and Group Methods, William E. Utterback will have general supervision of planning and conducting the round tables, and he will be assisted by a staff of well-qualified persons. Inquiries should be directed to Mr. Utterback at the Department of Speech, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

NUEA COMMITTEE

The Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials will hold its 1952 conference at the Sinton Hotel in Cincinnati on December 29 and 30, 1952. In addition to the usual business meetings and conferences, the Committee will sponsor a forum on the question "What form of international organization should the United States support?" Four outstanding leaders in American public life have accepted invitations to participate.

NEWS AND NOTES

JANET BOLTON, *Editor*

IN CONCLAVE

SPEECH FOR THE CLASSROOM TEACHER. Late in June the University of California at Los Angeles offered a ten-day workshop in Speech for the Classroom Teacher; the program was jointly planned by the speech staff of the Department of English in cooperation with University Extension. Designed to meet the speech problems of the average elementary or secondary teacher, the program provided for individual speech analyses of, and consultation with, each member enrolled, as well as units in improving the classroom student's speech, both normal and defective, and techniques for using the speech experience in teaching other subject matter. The workshop was under the direction of Donald E. Hargis, Assistant Professor of Speech, assisted by Elise S. Hahn and Waldo W. Phelps, also of the UCLA staff, and Frances W. Hebb, consultant in speech correction for the Montebello Unified School District.

CORNELL FESTIVAL OF CONTEMPORARY ARTS. The Sixth Annual Festival of Contemporary Arts was sponsored by Cornell University for a full week in April. The program offered rich opportunities for appreciation on theoretical and demonstration levels; lectures included "American Art of the Last Ten Years," "The Function of Painting and Sculpture in Modern Architecture," "In Search of Theatre," "Art in Modern Society," "The Problem of Form in Music and Literature," "The Artist as Human Being," and "Technology and the Artist," in addition to dance recitals, concerts, poetry reading, exhibits of art, architecture, and contemporary furniture, books and manuscripts, and cinematic and theatrical productions.

ENGLISH AND SPEECH CONFERENCE FOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS. In May the East Stroudsburg State Teachers' College of Pennsylvania held the second annual English and Speech Conference to aid teachers and trainees on both primary and secondary levels. Faculty of the college headed two encompassing panels in the Speech division of the meeting: "What skills should the primary teacher develop to detect and remedy general speech problems in the grades?" and "What kind of speech activities should be found on the primary level, and to what extent should these activities be used?"

DRAMA IN THE SCHOOLS CONFERENCE. The Department of Speech Writing and Drama of McCoy College of Johns Hopkins University sponsored for the third year a May conference on educational children's theatre. The one-day program featured both policies and practices in school theatre, ranging from general considerations of international children's theatre and teacher training for play production to the specific problems of choosing the play and demonstrations in stagecraft and acting. The conference, attended by representatives of some two hundred and fifty private and public schools in Maryland closed with a student production of Henry de Mountherlant's "Queen after Death" in the Playshop on campus.

POETS IN ATTENDANCE AT READING FESTIVAL. Marianne Moore, distinguished winner of the Pulitzer and Bollingen Prizes in Poetry, and Langston Hughes were guests at the Twenty-Third Annual Poetry Reading Festival held at Long Island University in April. Student readers represented twelve Eastern colleges and universities.

MICHIGAN SUMMER CONFERENCES. In addition to its annual summer Speech Conference which featured addresses by Lionel Crocker, J. Garber Drushal, Barnard A. Hewitt, Harold Westlake, H. P. Constans, Valentine Windt, and Walt Koste, the University of Michigan Department of Speech sponsored two additional special meetings, each for the first time. "Speech and the Preacher," under the direction of Winton H. Beaven, which attracted more than sixty practicing clergymen, was planned to aid the ministers in speech problems. The second conference, conducted by William M. Sattler, was a training course in group participation and conference leadership for business leaders; thirty representatives of fourteen large industrial organizations participated in the three-day meeting.

NEW YORK SPEECH ASSOCIATION OFFICERS. Officers were elected to a two-year term at a Buffalo

meeting of the New York Speech Association in April: President, Mrs. Doris Goodrich, Rochester; Vice-president, Miss Yetta Mitchell, New York City; Secretary, William Adams, Cortland; Treasurer, James Pletcher, Lockport; Editor of Bulletin, Miss Roberta Barnett, Ithaca. Elected to the Executive Council were: Earl Ryan, New York; Ralph Smith, Buffalo; Paul Pettit, Albany; Mildred Martin, Tonawanda. Among the resolutions adopted by the session were: (1) that the Association request the appointment of a Supervisor of Speech for the Schools of the State, and (2) that the New York State Speech Association request representation on the council for television when a policy for educational television is set up by the Board of Regents.

WORKSHOP IN INDUSTRIAL AND BUSINESS SPEECH COMMUNICATIONS. A Workshop for industrial training and personnel directors was held on the campus of the Pennsylvania State College during the week of June 1-6. Somewhat unusual in the field of training in communications, the workshop presented an intensive week's study and practice in the most effective methods of conducting training for improvement in practical speech communications. Under the direction of Harold P. Zelko, Professor of Public Speaking at Penn State, the program included talks by leading experts from industry, government, and the universities, discussions and demonstrations by staff members of principles and methods of speech communication training, and practice in instruction methods and speaking by group members. Companies represented in attendance were the Eastman Kodak Company, SKF Industries, the Socony-Vacuum Oil Company of Venezuela, General Motors, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, New York and Pennsylvania Paper Company, Sylvania Electric Products Company, Corning Glass Company, and Ansul Chemical Company.

HEARING PROBLEMS SUBJECT OF SCHOOL NURSES' INSTITUTE. The Audiology faculty of the University of Pittsburgh provided leadership for the first Annual Institute for School Nurses. Charlotte Avery, Assistant Professor of Speech Pathology, and Leo. M. Doerfler, Associate Professor and Director of the Department of Audiology, placed Hearing Problems of the Child before the attending nursing personnel at Eye and Ear Hospital, Pittsburgh.

INAUGURATION OF ANNUAL HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH FESTIVAL AT TEMPLE. Sponsored by Temple University in April, the first High School Speech Festival under the direction of Gordon Hostettler and staff members of the Radio-Speech-Theatre Department brought students from thirty-five high schools representing a four-state area.

INSTITUTE IN VOICE PATHOLOGY. The Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center, affiliated with Western Reserve University, sponsored August 1 and 2 an institute on Voice Pathology and the First International Meeting of Laryngectomized Persons. Sharing responsibility for the conferences were national, community, and university groups including the American Cancer Society, the Cleveland Academy of Medicine, the National Cancer Institute of Institutes of Public Health, the Cleveland Otolaryngological Club, the Lost Chord Club of Cleveland, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the School of Medicine, and the Department of Speech of Western Reserve University. The institute offered both a professional meeting of medical and speech specialists in voice problems for a comprehensive survey of etiology and the treatment of voice disorders, and an opportunity for the exchange of ideas in reference to teaching esophageal speech and recreational and vocational rehabilitation. August 1 meetings scheduled sections on laryngeal diseases and their therapy, reports on research on voice, including psychosomatic aspects, and a section on dysphonias and their treatment. The August 2 sessions were devoted largely to laryngectomy, including surgical problems and procedures, a report of observation by fluoroscope of esophageal speech, and the rehabilitation of laryngectomized persons.

IN THE CURRICULUM

NEW COURSE FOR DIRECTORS OF DRAMATICS. A unique dramatic training was offered teachers in the summer session at the University of Delaware in a new course for graduate credit entitled The School Dramatic Program. Course content was based on the results of extensive questionnaires sent to principals and directors of dramatics, which indicated that rehearsal techniques, production problems, play selection, organization of dramatic activities, and development of facilities were major problem areas. During the term, teachers worked with students of high school and junior high school age in rehearsal and production of one-act plays for public presentation, a laboratory activity under

supervision in which teachers dealt with students of the same age groups they supervise during the school year.

SPECIAL SUMMER PROGRAM AT KENT STATE. Kent State University conducted a number of special workshops and programs during the summer session: a cerebral palsy workshop for doctors, nurses, and other professional workers with handicapped children, in addition to its annual summer clinic, a special summer program in speech activities for high school teachers, and its Seventeenth Annual High School Institute in Speech, a concentrated sequence of speech activities for high school students who work under the direction of college personnel.

MICHIANA SUMMER THEATRE-IN-THE-DUNES WORKSHOP. Purdue University offered accredited courses in Acting Techniques and Characterization, Play Production, History of the Theatre, and Creative Dramatics for Children, in addition to workshops in Theatre, Dance, and Art and Crafts at the Michiana Summer Theatre-in-the-Dunes Workshop from June 30 to August 30.

SUMMER PROGRAM IN AUDIOLOGY AT NORTHWESTERN. The summer session at Northwestern University featured concentrated study in several areas of audiology; the six and nine-week programs were set up in sequences, each including three courses plus a series of associated observation and participation activities, arranged according to professional needs and interests: the Evaluation and Management of Children with Impaired Hearing, Auditory Testing, Educational Audiology, Advanced Clinical Audiology, the Management of Young Children, Language Development and Audiology for the Hearing Aid Specialist. A Symposium in Language Needs and Language Behavior of Children was offered either for credit or for auditor enrollment.

MAJOR AT OBERLIN. With the addition of advanced courses, the history of American public address, and an introductory course in speech correction, plus new offerings in theatre arts, Oberlin College now offers a major in speech, with emphasis either in public address or in drama.

STANFORD SUMMER PATHOLOGY COURSES. In addition to the regular curriculum in speech correction and audiology, two special courses were offered for the summer session at Stanford University—Stuttering: Modern Theories and Therapies, and Speech Correction for the Physically Handicapped, the latter dealing primarily with cerebral palsy. Dr. Mary Huber, Director of the Speech Clinic in the May T. Morrison Rehabilitation Center, San Francisco, was visiting professor for the session in charge of both courses. The studies were supplemented by the organization of two special clinics, one in stuttering and one for the physically handicapped, in addition to the regular Speech and Hearing Clinic program.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

ASSISTANT DIRECTORSHIP OF SPEECH IMPROVEMENT IN NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS. The Board of Education of the City of New York in March appointed Miss Evelyn Konigsberg to the newly created position of Assistant Director of Speech Improvement for the New York City Schools. Prior to the appointment, Miss Konigsberg was chairman of the Speech Department at Jamaica High School; she assumed her duties as assistant to Director Letitia Raubicheck immediately. Miss Konigsberg is well known to national Speech Association members through her significant contributions to the field over a number of years; she has served as High School Editor of *QJS* and as Second Vice-President of SAA. She is now Editor of Publications of the Eastern States Association, High School Editor of the *Educational Theatre Journal*, and Chairman of the Committee on Problems in Secondary Schools of the *Speech Association of America*.

APPOINTMENTS:

University of Arkansas: George R. Kernodle, graduate assistant in theatre.

Cornell University: George R. McCalmon, director of dramatic activities at Florida State University (Tallahassee), to be associate professor of speech and drama and director of the Cornell theatre.

Lehigh University: Donald L. Freshley, instructor in speech and director of debate.

University of Michigan: Edward Stasheff, associate professor of Speech specializing in television; Edgar Willis, associate professor of speech, specializing in courses in radio; George Herman, assistant professor of speech, specializing in audiology.

University of Missouri: Webster L. Smalley, instructor in speech; Eugene C. Reynolds, instructor in speech and adviser to student union

activities in drama and radio; Manuel I. Kuhr, graduate assistant in public speaking; Frances L. McCurdy, instructor in speech; Barbara Higdon, instructor in speech; A. Craig Baird, visiting professor of speech (second semester, 1952-53).

Oberlin College: Charley A. Leistner, instructor in speech.

University of Pittsburgh: Barbara McIntyre, instructor in children's theatre; Betty Jane McWilliams, instructor in speech correction and speech correctionist at Children's Hospital; David L. Schmuckler, lecturer.

Purdue University: Jack M. Bain, instructor in speech.

University of Southern California: William H. Perkins, assistant professor of speech.

University of Virginia: J. Jeffery Auer, professor of speech and chairman of the department of speech.

PROMOTIONS:

University of Kansas City: Edward W. Borgers, assistant professor of dramatic art.

University of Michigan: William B. Halstead, professor of speech; D. E. Morley, associate professor of speech; Hayden K. Carruth, assistant professor of speech.

Oberlin College: Robert S. Gunderson, associate professor of speech.

FROM THE PRESS

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY EDITORSHIP. The American Book Company announces the appointment of Everett T. Calvert as Editor-in-Chief. Dr. Calvert, a graduate of La Verne College, holds the doctorate from Yale University. A native of California, he has taught in both rural and urban elementary schools in that state, at Yale and at the University of Southern California, and has been for the past eleven years principal of Washington Elementary School in Pasadena. Education, with special concentration in curriculum, child development, and administration, is his area of interest. Dr. Calvert succeeds W. W. Livengood in the editorial position; Mr. Livengood assumes new duties as Executive Assistant to the President.

PRONUNCIATION MANUAL. The School and College Service, Columbus, Ohio, has now in publication a pronunciation manual prepared by faculty members of the Speech and Hearing Clinic at Kent State University. John R. Montgomery, associate professor of speech and director of the speech and hearing clinics, Eleanor L. Gray, assistant professor of speech, Katherine Moore Norton, instructor in speech, and Arthur L. Kaltenborn, assistant professor of speech, assisted in the compilation.

ON THE STAGES

CORNELL SPRING OFFERINGS. Romantic tragedy opened, and French classic comedy closed the spring season at Cornell, with American realistic drama and Gilbert and Sullivan intervening. A production of *Romeo and Juliet* was the feature of Junior Week in February, followed later in the month by *Desire Under the Elms.* In March, the Dramatic and Glee Clubs presented *The Pirates of Penzance;* Odet's *Awake and Sing* and Moliere's *The School for Wives* were May and June productions, respectively, the latter in celebration of Senior and Alumni Week.

ANNUAL CHILDREN'S THEATRE TOUR. The Fifth Annual Childrens' Theatre Tour of the E/52 Players of the University of Delaware featured "Pinocchio" as its spring presentation. The tour was launched by two campus performances, and after ten appearances in the state, the production was taken to Washington, D. C., on the Children's Program of the Recreation Department. The company was seen by some seven thousand children; the complete total of the E/52 Players' season was twenty-nine performances of seven plays viewed by some thirteen thousand people.

DENISON UNIVERSITY 1951-52 SEASON. In June, the four theatres operated by the Department of Theatre Arts at Denison University, Ohio, brought to a close a record year. In the twelve-month period, the University, Studio, Children's, and Summer Theatres have presented a total of thirty full evening events for a run of 134 performances, an audience of 45,000 and a box-office gross of more than $134,000. Productions have included a wide range of drama in both conventional proscenium arch and arena style staging. Two American premieres, "Home at Seven," by R. W. Sheriff, and "Prophesy to the Wind," by Norman Nicholson, and three original scripts by Denison students represented original and experimental work; *Tartuffe, Henry IV, The Skin of Our Teeth,* and *The Birds,* representative modern drama and opera; *Martine, Woyzeck, Yes is for a very Young Man,* and *The Medium,* and popular fare, *The Silver Whistle, Good-bye, My Fancy, Knickerbocker Holiday,* and *The Hasty Heart,* composed a widely diversified program. Chil-

dren of the area saw *Jack and the Beanstalk* and *The Land of the Dragon*. In addition to the campus program, the department furnished three packaged touring play companies made up of graduates; these groups were booked a year in advance by professional agents, and toured twenty-five states for a total of sixty-five weeks of performance.

HOTEL UNIVERSE ARENA STYLE. In late March, Philip Barry's *Hotel Universe* was given a theatre-in-the-round staging in the Penthouse Theatre at Fordham University with design and staging by William Riva of NBC Television.

BALTIMORE CHILDREN'S THEATRE. A children's version of Maeterlinck's *The Blue Bird* was given two May performances in the Baltimore Museum of Art by the Johns Hopkins Childrens' Educational Theatre; a cast of one hundred children in age range from six to sixteen represented elementary and secondary public and private schools. During the summer session at the University, the Theatre sponsored two programs of plays for children: the first series was composed of creative dramatizations by six to ten-year-olds of three myths and legends, *The Ant and the Grasshopper*, *Pandora's Box*, and *William Tell;* the second program was a presentation on three successive days by separate casts of *Flibbertygibbet*, a new play by Charlotte Chorpenning and Nora Tully MacAlvay.

RELATED ARTS DEMONSTRATION IN MUSICAL PLAY STAGING. Milwaukee-Downer College performed an experiment in theatre during the spring semester with the creation of a musical play in three successive stages. Zachary Gold's "Spring over Brooklyn," in a musical adaptation by David MacArthur, was the framework upon which dialogue and dramatization, then music and dance, and finally stage settings were progressively built. The cumulative production was organized to illustrate the integration of the arts, and provided a preliminary step in reorganizing the Related Arts course at the college. With the art fusions demonstrated by the musical, the Related Arts study this fall is to include drama and dance, as well as music and art.

THEATRE SCHEDULE AT SAN JOSE. The spring season at San Jose State College featured *There's Always Juliet*, *Lady in the Dark*, and *Nights of Wrath*, Armand Salacrou's drama of the French occupation; James Clery prepared the English translation and directed the production for presentation at the American National Theatre and Academy Drama Festival at Monterey. The 1952-53 schedule lists *The Importance of Being Earnest*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, an unselected modern European play, *Sheep's Well*, *The Innocents*, and *Under the Gaslight*.

YALE SPRING SEASON. The spring months saw a group of productions at Yale University that juxtaposed the contemporary and classic, scholarly adaptation and theatrical experiment. In March, a production of Moliere's *The Imaginary Invalid*, in a new adaptation by a drama major from Tel-Aviv, was presented in celebration of International Theatre Month. April featured an original, "Song for a Broken Horn," by a student in playwriting with a score by a member of the Music School faculty. Later in the month, *The Birds*, in a new adaptation by Walter Kerr, was a combined presentation of the Dramatic Association and the Glee Club. In May, the Elizabethan Club presented a hitherto undiscovered play by John Lyly titled simply "An Entertainment," the manuscript of which was discovered in the British Museum by a secretary working under the instruction of Leslie Hotson, former Yale faculty member and Shakespearean authority. Mr. Hotson supervised rehearsals and will contribute the introduction to the publication of the play this fall. "An Entertainment" was first presented in Surrey in 1598 in honor of a visit by Queen Elizabeth. Furthering the Elizabethan tradition in mid-May, Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* was presented in the Experimental Theatre with incidental music selected from the works of Benjamin Britten.

IN THE STUDIOS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA TELEVISION. The University of Florida is continuing the series of television programs initiated last year over Station WMBR-TV in Jacksonville. "Knowledge in Action," designed primarily for adults, is viewed each week by an audience of approximately 50,000. The programs are prepared as a package show by members of a production staff headed by T. C. Botten, Assistant Professor of Speech, with faculty members of the various departments of the university cooperating. During the academic year 1951-52, thirty-two programs were presented dealing with research in the fields of psychology, chemistry, art, music, engineering, public speaking, biology, pharmacy, agriculture, physical education, and literature.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM SERIES AT ILLINOIS NAVY PIER DIVISION. The University of Illinois Chicago Undergraduate Division was presenting during the spring five educational programs a week over Station WBIK-FM. Two weekly programs presented half-hour courses in psychology and English Literature; a third featured round table discussion of current events; the fourth was a sequence of fifteen-minute lectures on basic contributions to modern science; and the fifth was designed to acquaint the listener with the workings of a university. Wayne Thompson was coordinator for the series.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH RADIO. For the fourth successive year, the Speech Department of the University of Pittsburgh conducted a discussion program weekly on Station WPGH; rebroadcasts were carried by Stations WMCK and WDUQ. Likewise, during the past year, the University has cooperated with other educational institutions in Pittsburgh to provide programs and advice for the Duquesne University FM Station program, "The Voice of Education."

AT THE CLINICS AND LABORATORIES

THREE YEAR CEREBRAL PALSY DEMONSTRATION COMPLETED. In August the Cerebral Palsy Center at Bowling Green University closed its three year operation under the joint auspices of the University and the Ohio Society for Crippled Children. The Center was established in October, 1949, and treated in residence fourteen boys and girls at a time, ranging from four to eight years in age; a total of thirty-one children from all sections of the state were enrolled during the demonstration. Living on campus, for eleven months of the year, the youngsters were given speech and hearing therapy and muscular training from trained physical and occupational therapists working under medical direction. To the staff in residence and professional therapists were added the consultative services of Winthrop M. Phelps, Baltimore authority on cerebral palsy, and Harold Westlake of the Department of Speech Correction and Audiology at Northwestern University. Prudence L. Brown, Assistant Professor of Speech at Bowling Green, and acting director of the project in 1951, will prepare a full report and evaluation of the Center's work.

CLINICAL SERVICES ADDITION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA. The establishment of a Marriage and Family Clinic adds a new unit to the Florida Center of Clinical Services at the University of Florida. Other clinics now operating in this program of services to university students and residents of the state include the Bureau of Vocational Guidance and Mental Hygiene, the Speech and Hearing Clinic, the Reading Laboratory and Clinic, and the Adapted and Corrective Exercises Clinic. Darrel J. Mase is Coordinator of the Center.

KENT STATE SUMMER WORKSHOP AND CLINIC. During the 1952 summer session, the Speech and Hearing Division of Kent State University conducted a cerebral palsy workshop for doctors, nurses, and other professional workers with handicapped children. In addition, the Division offered the Children's Summer Clinic for the seventh successive year, featuring special courses in lip reading, hearing communication, and speech for the deaf.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY GRADUATE APPOINTMENTS. Stanford University announces the availability of several fellowships and assistantships in speech correction and audiology for qualified students during the current year. These include teaching assistantships in the basic voice and diction courses and language training programs for foreign students, and supervisory or clinical assistantships in the Speech and Hearing Clinic. Remuneration varies with the amount and type of work done. Inquiries should be addressed to Virgil Anderson, Director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic, Stanford University.

FROM PLATFORM AND CONFERENCE TABLE

1952-53 PLANS AT ILLINOIS CHICAGO UNDERGRADUATE DIVISION. Forensic events will be monthly fall and winter features at the University of Illinois at Navy Pier in Chicago. The second National Contest in Public Discussion sets a November 1 deadline for filing Intention of Entry and a final date for shipping the 25-minute tape recordings on November 15. The Fifth Annual UIC Freshman-Sophomore Debate Tournament and its four rounds of conventional debate is scheduled for December 13. On January 10 the campus will be host to its Second Annual High School Tournament, which is restricted to Illinois and Indiana schools within a seventy-five mile radius.

LINFIELD COLLEGE FORENSICS. The Twenty-Second Annual Intercollegiate Forensic Tournament at Linfield College, Oregon, drew five hundred delegates from thirty-seven colleges

and universities in the six western states. One hundred forty-seven teams were entered in the debate division.

READING AT MISSOURI SUMMER SESSION CONFERENCE. Joseph F. Smith, Chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of Hawaii, was visiting lecturer and reader for the 1952 summer session conference at the University of Missouri. During the week of June 16, Professor Smith appeared each day in a public reading hour, presenting Drinkwater's *Abraham Lincoln*, Alan Paton's *Cry the Beloved Country*, Benet's *Western Star*, and "The American Credo," a lecture recital on important American documents.

TKA SPEAKER-OF-THE-YEAR AWARDS. The Twelfth Annual National Conference of Tau Kappa Alpha at Case Institute of Technology in April featured for the second time the fraternity awards to outstanding speakers on the 1951 American scene. Members of the National Board of Awards, after receiving nominations from undergraduate chapters, faculty members, and the public, selected the following men: in business and commerce, Michael V. DiSalle; in education, W. Norwood Brigance; in religion, Louis H. Evans; in national affairs, Dean Acheson.

PERSONAL NOTES

DRUMMOND RETIREMENT AT CORNELL. In July, Alexander M. Drummond became Professor Emeritus of Drama at Cornell University, the campus he has for forty-five years made respected for its leading department of speech and drama. Since his appointment to the Cornell teaching staff in 1907, his years have seen the growth of a vigorous university theatre, important contributions to the American theatrical scene, both in ideas and personnel, and highly successful and pungent teaching. Professor Drummond's personal credits—directing, playwriting, and production, lecture and criticism, and the instilling into hosts of students a regard for and skills in theatre—are a significant combination of the theatrical and the academic. At a time when dramatic organizations over the country struggled for academic recognition, it was largely through Drummond's efforts that Cornell became one of the first universities to include dramatic production in its graduate and undergraduate curricula. The holder of the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters from Hamilton College, Drummond was elected a corporate member of the American National Theatre and Academy, and was made the first honorary president of the National Theatre Conference in 1948. His interests in the past fifteen years have embraced the preservation of New York State folklore, particularly for dramatic use, a project that has actively occupied him since 1947. His twenty-year chairmanship of an outstanding department of speech and drama and his presidency of the National Association of Teachers of Speech in 1921 brought benefits to the entire field of speech through his talent for combining the academic with the professional. Testimonials at his retirement dinner in May came from chancellors, deans, and students, neon names on Broadway and in Hollywood, and directors of small community theatres, a large cross section of people for and through whom he helped make the American theatre important.

Cynthia Larry, University of Florida, during the summer session attended the Linguistic Institute at Indiana University on a grant-in-aid from the American Council of Learned Societies. . . . *James Abel* of Brooklyn College was visiting professor at the University of Florida summer session, in which he taught classes in phonetics and voice and diction. . . . *Frances McCune Gaulson*, Director of Dramatics at the University of Illinois Chicago Division, received an appointment to do special work during the summer quarter at the Shakespeare Institute in Stratford-on-Avon; the study is carried on in association with the University of Birmingham under the direction of Allardyce Nicoll. . . . *James N. Holm* and *John R. Montgomery* of the Kent State Staff were visiting faculty at Montana State and Ohio State summer sessions respectively. . . . *H. Barrett Davis*, head of the Division of Speech at Lehigh University, was elected Vice-President of the Pennsylvania Speech Association, and President of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania State Colleges, in addition to his position on the Executive Committee of the Speech Association; he and his committee are organizing a program for the certification of teachers of speech in the secondary schools in Pennsylvania. . . . University of Pittsburgh news: *Mildred Ann Ditty* has been elected Executive Secretary of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges; *Theresa Mavrintz*, former lecturer and costume and make-up supervisor for the Pitt Players, is stationed in Zagreb, Yugoslavia, as Cultural Affairs Officer with the U. S. Department of State; *William S. Tacey* is Executive Secretary